

**SUMMARY AND TRANSCRIPT OF ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE
CFA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
APRIL 2, 2024**

Secretary’s note: This index is provided only as a courtesy to the readers and is not an official part of the CFA minutes. The numbers shown for each item in the index are keyed to similar numbers shown in the body of the minutes.

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----------|
| (1) | APPEAL HEARING. | 16 |
| (2) | APPROVE ORDERS OF THE DAY..... | 17 |
| (3) | RATIFICATION OF ONLINE MOTIONS..... | 19 |
| (4) | JUDGING PROGRAM REPORT. | 24 |
| (5) | CENTRAL OFFICE OPERATIONS. | 49 |
| (6) | CLUB MEMBERSHIP..... | 51 |
| (7) | SHOW RULES..... | 53 |
| (8) | INTERNATIONAL DIVISION..... | 66 |
| (9) | VIRTUAL CAT COMPETITION. | 71 |
| (10) | JUNIOR FANCIERS..... | 74 |
| (11) | EXPERIMENTAL FORMATS..... | 75 |
| (12) | BOARD-SPONSORED DELEGATE PROPOSALS. | 78 |
| (13) | OTHER COMMITTEES. | 84 |
| (14) | NEW BUSINESS..... | 85 |
| (15) | OLD BUSINESS..... | 93 |
| (16) | DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS AND SUSPENSIONS..... | 94 |

SUMMARY

(1) APPROVE ORDERS OF THE DAY.

The Orders of the Day, as amended, were accepted without objection and became the Orders of Business.

Reports of Officers, Boards, and Standing Committees

(2) RATIFICATION OF ONLINE MOTIONS.

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|----|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| 1. | Executive Committee 02.01.2024 | Due to a clerk shortage, grant an exception to Show Rule 9.08.n. to allow the Alianza Felina club to ring share their 6 ring show, holding 3 rings in the morning and 3 rings in the afternoon at its show on February 3, 2024 in Malaga, Spain (Region 9). | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |
| 2. | Executive Committee 02.02.2024 | For the Japan Dancing Cat Club's February 11, 2024 show in Yokohama, Japan (Region 8), grant an exception to Show Rule 5.01.m. to increase the entry limit from 120 to 130. The club will issue a new flyer, publicize the change, and send notifications to all entered exhibitors and judges. | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |
| 3. | Executive Committee 02.05.2024 | Allow the Persian and Exotic Club to have one OCP Ring at its April 20/21, 2024 show in Hong Kong (International Division). The ring will use Suki Lee, an allbreed judge on the regular slate. Scoring would be for grand points only for the op/ch and op/pr portion of the final with no points awarded in breed. If the minimums are not achieved, that portion of the final will not be held. | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |
| 4. | Executive Committee 02.08.2024 | Due to a clerk shortage and low entry, grant an exception to Show Rule 9.08.n. to allow the Pawprints in the Sand and Chamberlin on the Bay Cat Clubs to ring share their 6 ring one day show, holding 2 of its rings in the morning and 2 rings in the afternoon, with the remaining 2 rings on their regular schedule, at their show on February 10, 2024 in Newport News, Virginia (Region 7). | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |
| 5. | Executive Committee 02.17.2024 | Grant an exception to Show Rule 4.14 and allow Jeri Zottoli to judge in place of Melanie Morgan at the Black Diamond Cat Club/Ramapo Cat Fanciers show February 18, 2024 in York Pennsylvania (Region 1). | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |
| 6. | Anger Huhtaniemi 02.19.2024 | Accept the resignation of Morning Yang as a CFA Associate Judge, effective April 30, 2024, with regret. | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |
| 7. | Executive Committee 02.21.2024 | Grant an exception to Show Rule 9.08.n. to allow the Sunshine Cat Club to ring share at their show, consisting of an allbreed ring in the morning and a single specialty ring in the afternoon (or vice versa) at their show on March 16, 2024 in Vantaa, Finland (Region 9). | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| 8. | Executive Committee 02.23.2024 | For its February 24/25, 2024 show in Shanghai China (ID-China), (1) grant an exception to Show Rule 4.14 and allow the Mountain City Cat Fanciers Club to change its show format from a two-day show to a back-to-back show, and (2) grant an exception to Show Rule 5.01.m. to decrease the entry limit from 450 to 225. The club will issue a new flyer, publicize the change, and send notifications to all entered exhibitors and judges. | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |
| 9. | Executive Committee 02.27.2024 | Grant an exception to Show Rule 4.14 and allow the China Ace Cat Club to add a specialty ring at their March 3/4, 2024 show in Chengdu, China (ID-China), changing the show license from 6 AB/3 SP to 6 AB/4 SP. | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |
| 10. | Executive Committee 02.29.2024 | Allow the United Feline Odyssey club to have 2 OCP Rings (one each day) at their April 6/7, 2024 show in Hong Kong (International Division). The rings are stand-alone, using judges on the regular slate. Scoring would be for grand points only for the op/ch and op/pr portion of the final with no points awarded in breed. If the minimum entries are not achieved, that portion of the final will not be held. | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |
| 11. | Executive Committee 03.05.2024 | For its March 16, 2024 show in LiaoCheng Shandong, China (ID-China), grant the China Brilliant Cat Club an exception to Judging Program Rule 12.4.b. and allow Jorgen Billing to guest judge in place of Nancy Dodds. | Motion Failed. |
| 12. | Executive Committee 03.05.2024 | Reconsider the previous motion. | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |
| 14. | Executive Committee 03.18.2024 | For the Delaware River Cats' proposed show scheduled April 13/14, 2024 in Region 1, grant an exception to Show Rule 4.04 (second paragraph) and allow the show to be licensed with less than 30 days remaining prior to the opening day of the show. | Motion Failed. Anger, Calhoun and Webb abstained for conflict. |
| 15. | Executive Committee 03.20.2024 | Reconsider the previous motion. | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |
| 16. | Executive Committee 03.21.2024 | For the Delaware River Cats' proposed show scheduled April 13/14, 2024 in Region 1, grant an exception to Show Rule 4.04 (second paragraph) and allow the show to be licensed with less than 30 days remaining prior to the opening day of the show. | Motion Failed. Anger, Calhoun and Webb abstained. |

Ms. Anger moved to ratify Motions #1-#10, #12 and #15. Seconded by **Mr. Currle**, the motion was **ratified by unanimous consent**.

(3) JUDGING PROGRAM REPORT.

Co-Chair Mr. Webb made a standing motion to adopt all Judging Program motions.

Advancements – Regular Judging Program:

Advance from Longhair Trainee to Longhair Apprentice (1st Specialty):

Alex Chun Lap (Hong Kong) 16 yes (Mathis did not vote)

Advance from Apprentice Shorthair to Approval Pending Shorthair (2nd Specialty):

Mie Takahashi (Hyogo, Japan) 16 yes (Mathis did not vote)

Elevation to Emeritus Status:

Kayoko Koizumi (1993) Vote sealed

Restored to Guest Judge Roster:

Dmitriy Gubenko Cherkassy, Cherkas'Ka Oblast', Ukraine
 Jurgen Trautmann Daxberg Mömbris, Germany

Motion to remove the Social Media Guidelines as a stand-alone document from the CFA website and approve the revised Judges Code of Ethics which incorporates the social media policy for judges. Seconded by **Dr. Griswold**, the motion was **ratified by unanimous consent**.

Motion to adopt the following Judging Program rule changes, effective immediately.

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Section 5 - REQUIREMENTS FOR ASSOCIATE JUDGES FOR APPLICATION TO THE CFA REGULAR JUDGING PROGRAM | CFA Judging Program Committee | |
| Existing Wording | Proposed Wording | |
| None. | <u>5.4</u> The Associate Judging Program will no longer exist as of <u>May 1, 2029</u> . | |

Seconded by **Dr. Griswold**, the motion **failed**. Griswold, Moser and Shelton voting yes.

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Existing Wording | Proposed Wording |
| | <u>2.15 First Specialty Application Package.</u> <u>p. The Breeder Applicant must be an active member in good standing of a CFA Breed Council at the time of application.</u> |

Seconded by **Mr. Currle**, the motion was **ratified by unanimous consent**.

Motion to add vi. to Approved Guest Judge Level, “In order to maintain Approved Guest Judge Level, must judge 2 times in 3 years”, and vii. “Maintain their judging license with an approved association”. Seconded by **Ms. Anger**, **Motion Carried**. DelaBar abstained with conflict.

Motion to remove Cheryl U'Ren, Tatiana Slizhevskaya and Anna Nazarova from Approved Guest Judge Level due to no CFA guest judging in 3 or more years, or no longer holds a judging license. **No Action**, for lack of a second. [**Secretary's Note:** Deemed unnecessary due to previous motion.]

Ms. DelaBar moved to add two additional items to the Guest Judging Procedures (adopted 08.11.2020) under a. Approved Guest Level: vi. In order to maintain Approved Guest Judge Level, must judge 2 times in 3 years. and vii. Maintain their judging license with an approved association. Seconded by **Mr. Currle, Motion Carried.** Moser and Newkirk voting no.

Mr. Newkirk moved to reconsider Judging Program Rule 2.1 as follows: *The Applicant must be at least eighteen (18) years of age, understand and be able to speak English.* Seconded by **Mr. Currle**, the motion [to reconsider] was **ratified by unanimous consent.**

Mr. Newkirk moved to amend Judging Program Rule 2.1 as follows: *The Applicant must be at least eighteen (18) years of age, understand and be able to speak English.* Seconded by **Mr. Currle, Motion Carried.** Griswold, Huhtaniemi and Webb voting no.

Ms. Calhoun moved to reconsider the motion adopted at the December 5, 2023 teleconference requiring China Applicants to complete their Judging Program training outside of China. Seconded by **Mr. Newkirk, Motion Failed.** Calhoun, Colilla, DelaBar, Dunham, Hayata and Noble voting yes.

(4) **CENTRAL OFFICE OPERATIONS.**

Ms. Anger moved to provide cattery reports at no charge to a cattery owner from their eCat account, effective with the release of eCat 2.0, and cease sending cattery reports to breed council members, effective with 2024 memberships. Seconded by **Mr. Newkirk**, the motion was **ratified by unanimous consent.**

(5) **CLUB MEMBERSHIP.**

Chair Mrs. Krzanowski made a standing motion to adopt all Club Membership motions, with a standing second by **Mr. Newkirk**, as follows:

- Accept with regret the resignation of Alianza Felina, effective March 11, 2024. The motion was **ratified by unanimous consent.**
- That the club name Alianza Felina shall not be reissued or reused by any other CFA club. **Motion Carried.** DelaBar and Newkirk voting no.
- Accept with regret the resignation of Birmingham Feline Fanciers, effective January 23, 2024. The motion was **ratified by unanimous consent.**
- Accept with regret the resignation of Greater St. Louis Cat Club, effective January 23, 2024. The motion was **ratified by unanimous consent.**

(6) **SHOW RULES.**

Liaison Mrs. Krzanowski made a standing motion to adopt all Show Rules motions, with a standing second by **Mr. Webb**, as follows:

1. *Define the Allbreed and Specialty ribbons to be hung in Super Specialty finals.*

| Article XI – During the Show – Judging and Awards, amend 11.28 and 11.29 | CFA Central Office | |
|---|---|--|
| Existing Wording | Proposed Wording | |
| <p>11.28</p> <p>Standard Allbreed Rings</p> <p>...</p> <p>OCP Rings</p> <p>...</p> | <p>11.28</p> <p>Standard Allbreed Rings</p> <p>...</p> <p>OCP Rings</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>Super Specialty Rings</u></p> <p><u>In the Allbreed portion of a Super Specialty ring, the Championship finals awards will be Best through 10th Best Cat and Best, 2nd Best and 3rd Allbreed Best Champion when cat entries are less than 85. For Championship entries of 85 or more, the final awards will be Best through 15th Best Cat and Best through Fifth Best Allbreed Champion.</u></p> <p><u>In the Allbreed portion of a Super Specialty ring, Kitten finals awards will be Best through 10th Best Kitten when kitten entries are less than 75; for kitten entries of 75 or more the final awards will be Best through 15th Best Kitten.</u></p> <p><u>In the Allbreed portion of a Super Specialty ring, Premiership finals awards will be Best through 10th Best Cat and Best and 2nd Best Allbreed Premier when cat entries are less than 50. For Premiership entries of 50 or more, Best through 15th Best Cat, Best, 2nd, and 3rd Best Allbreed will be awarded.</u></p> | |
| <p>11.29 a. In Longhair/Shorthair Specialty rings the Championship finals will be Best through 10th Best Cat, Best, 2nd Best and 3rd Best Champion when cat entries are less than 85.</p> <p>For Championship entries of 85 or more, the final awards will be Best through 15th Best Cat; Best through Fifth Best Champion.</p> <p>Kitten finals awards will be Best through 10th Best Kitten when kitten entries are less than 75, for kitten entries of 75 or more the final awards will be Best through 15th Best Kitten.</p> <p>Premiership finals awards will be Best</p> | <p>11.29 a. In Longhair/Shorthair Specialty rings, <u>including the Longhair/Shorthair Specialty portions of a Super Specialty ring,</u> the Championship finals will be Best through 10th Best Cat, Best, 2nd Best and 3rd Best Champion when cat entries <u>in the particular specialty (longhair or shorthair)</u> are less than 85. For Championship entries of 85 or more <u>in the particular specialty (longhair or shorthair),</u> the final awards will be Best through 15th Best Cat; Best through Fifth Best Champion.</p> <p><u>In Longhair/Shorthair Specialty rings, including the Longhair/Shorthair Specialty</u></p> | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>through 10th Best Cat, Best and 2nd Best Premier when cat entries are less than 50. For Premiership entries of 50 or more, the final awards will be Best through 15th Best Cat; Best, 2nd Best and 3rd Best Premier.</p> <p>Veteran Class finals awards will be Best through 5th Best Cat or Best through 10th Best Cat as determined by show management.</p> <p>b....</p> | <p>portions of a Super Specialty ring, Kitten finals awards will be Best through 10th Best Kitten when kitten entries <u>in the particular specialty (longhair or shorthair)</u> are less than 75; for kitten entries of 75 or more <u>in the particular specialty (longhair or shorthair)</u> the final awards will be Best through 15th Best Kitten.</p> <p><u>In Longhair/Shorthair Specialty rings, including the Longhair/Shorthair Specialty portions of a Super Specialty ring,</u> Premiership finals awards will be Best through 10th Best Cat, Best and 2nd Best Premier when cat entries <u>in the particular specialty (longhair or shorthair)</u> are less than 50. For Premiership entries of 50 or more <u>in the particular specialty (longhair or shorthair)</u>, the final awards will be Best through 15th Best Cat; Best, 2nd Best and 3rd Best Premier.</p> <p>Veteran Class finals awards will be Best through 5th Best Cat or Best through 10th Best Cat as determined by show management.</p> <p>b....</p> |
|---|--|

Tabled.

2. *Delete the Addendum to the 2024-2025 Show Rules which extends the waiver of Show Rule 4.03 for the 2024-2025 show season.*

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Addendum | Show Rules Committee | |
| Existing Wording | Proposed Wording | |
| The waiver of Show Rule 4.03 is extended whereby cancelled shows during the 2024-2025 show season do not count against a club’s traditional date. | The waiver of Show Rule 4.03 is extended whereby cancelled shows during the 2024-2025 show season do not count against a club’s traditional date <u>in Region 9.</u> | |

Mrs. Krzanowski amended the motion to allow Region 9 to retain the traditional dates by adding the words *in Region 9* to the end of the sentence. The motion was **ratified by unanimous consent.**

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|--|
| Article IV – Licensing the Show, amend 4.03 e | CFA Board | |
| Existing Wording | Proposed Wording | |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>4.03 e. Clubs that hold traditional dates and do not plan to hold a show for one year should let the Show Scheduling Committee know as soon as possible. The date will be considered “vacant” for the one year only and will become available to the region or other club(s) for a one-time only show date.</p> <p>With the permission of the Show Scheduling Committee, another club may hold a one-time only show on the vacant weekend.</p> | <p>4.03 e. Clubs that hold traditional dates and do not plan to hold a show for one year should <u>must</u> let the Show Scheduling Committee know <u>at least 150 days prior to the traditional date, as soon as possible</u>. The date will be considered “vacant” for the one year only and will become available to the region or other club(s) for a one-time only show date. <u>A club which fails to provide the required notice will be required to pay a \$200 penalty.</u></p> <p>With the permission of the Show Scheduling Committee, another club may hold a one-time only show on the vacant weekend.</p> |
|--|---|

Withdrawn.

(7) INTERNATIONAL DIVISION.

Co-Chair Ms. Calhoun moved that the point requirement for kittens for a DW Award in Kuwait be reduced to fifty points and the point requirement for premiership be reduced to 40 points for the 2024-2025 show season. Seconded by **Ms. Anger, Tabled.**

Ms. Calhoun moved to allow an exception to Show Rule 8.05 – Ring sponsorship, etc. for Kuwait for the 2024-2025 show season. **Tabled.**

Ms. Calhoun moved for an additional \$15,000 for AWS for the purpose of re-energizing several of the clubs to put on shows, reserving the right to vote no. For lack of a second, **No Action.**

Mr. Currle moved for a revision in the following Divisional Winner (SI) points, and elimination of qualifying rings for Singapore in the coming show season:

1. Half the points for Kitten (50 instead of 100)
2. Half the points for Championship (100 instead of 200)
3. Premiership : Remains at 100.
4. HHP: Remains at 50.

Seconded by **Ms. Calhoun**, the motion was **ratified by unanimous consent.**

(8) VIRTUAL CAT COMPETITION.

Chair Ms. Kerr had no action items.

(9) JUNIOR FANCIERS.

Chair Ms. Shaffer had no action items.

(10) EXPERIMENTAL FORMATS.

Chair Ms. Anger presented the following action items:

- Grant an exception to Show Rule 7.01 and 11.35 and allow the Global Egyptian Mau Society/Cat Fanciers Of Washington to hold breed specialty rings for Egyptian Maus in the allbreed rings at their co-sponsored 10 ring back to back show on July 27-28, 2024 In Chantilly, Virginia (Region 7) in the following manner: all classes (Kittens, Championship and Premiership) will be judged consecutively and awarded in the usual manner, which will include top three breed awards; then, a breed specialty final for each breed will be held across all classes (i.e., including Kittens, Championship and Premiership competing together in a breed specialty final). Awards will be given based on the total Breed entry for each breed as follows: up to 15 entries = top 3; 15 to 20 entries = top 4; 25 or more entries = top 5. No points will be associated with these awards. The motion was **ratified by unanimous consent**.
- For its April 13/14, 2024 show in Taylor, Michigan (Region 4), allow Just Cat-In Around Cat Fanciers to hold a one-on-one traditional style ring on Sunday, April 14, 2024, conducted by Allbreed Judge Rachel Anger. The motion was **ratified by unanimous consent**.

(11) BOARD-SPONSORED DELEGATE PROPOSALS.

A motion to sponsor the following Bylaw amendments was **Withdrawn**.

Proposed Amendments to the CFA Bylaws

Deleted text is shown with a ~~strike through~~ and new text is underscored. Unless otherwise stated, any Constitutional Amendments are effective immediately.

- 1 - CFA Executive Board

RESOLVED: Amend the CFA Bylaws, ARTICLE VIII – REGIONS, Section 1 -- Geographical Boundaries, to redefine regional boundaries to avoid splitting states between regions, as follows:

ARTICLE VIII — REGIONS

Section 1 – Geographical Boundaries

The United States, Canada, Bermuda, Mexico, Japan and Europe are divided into nine (9) geographical regions as follows:

REGION 1 - NORTH ATLANTIC

Bermuda, Canada (East of the 77th meridian), Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York (~~East of the 77th meridian~~), Pennsylvania (~~East of the 77th meridian~~), Rhode Island, and Vermont.

REGION 2 - NORTHWEST

Alaska, ~~California (North of the 36th parallel)~~, Canada (West of the Western border of Manitoba), Idaho, Montana, Nevada (~~North of the 37th parallel~~), Oregon, Utah and Washington.

REGION 3 - GULF SHORE

Arkansas, Colorado, ~~Kansas (South of the 38th parallel)~~, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Tennessee (~~West of the Tennessee River~~), Texas, Wyoming, and the Mexican states of Aguascalientes, Campeche, Chiapas, Chihuahua, Coahuila, Colima, Durango, Federal District, Guanajuato, Guerrero,

Hidalgo, Jalisco, México, Michoacán, Morelos, Nayarit, Nuevo Leon, Oaxaca, Puebla, Querétaro, Quintana Roo, San Luis Potosí, Tabasco, Tamaulipas, Tlaxcala, Veracruz, Yucatán, and Zacatecas.

REGION 4 - GREAT LAKES

Canada (East of the 90th meridian and West of the 77th meridian), Kentucky (~~North of the 38th parallel~~), Michigan, New York (~~West of the 77th meridian~~), Ohio, Pennsylvania (~~West of the 77th meridian~~), and West Virginia.

REGION 5 - SOUTHWEST

Arizona, California (~~South of the 36th parallel~~), Hawaii, Nevada (~~South of the 37th parallel~~), and the Mexican states of Baja California Norte, Baja California Sur, Sinaloa, and Sonora.

REGION 6 - MIDWEST

Canada (East of the Western border of Manitoba and West of the 90th meridian), Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas (~~North of the 38th parallel~~), Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

REGION 7 - SOUTHERN

Alabama, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky (~~South of the 38th parallel~~), Maryland, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee (~~East of the Tennessee River~~), the U.S. Virgin Islands, and Virginia.

REGION 8 - JAPAN

Japan.

REGION 9 - EUROPE

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Kosovo, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Macedonia, Malta, Monaco, Moldova, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom.

RATIONALE: While GPS coordinates might define a specific location, it is far easier to articulate a location/region by its state boundaries when making decisions that potentially affect in what region a person resides. Using state boundaries removes any possibility of misinterpretation of actual residential information and assignment of region to an exhibitor.

– 2 – *CFA Executive Board*

RESOLVED: Effective June 28, 2026, amend the CFA Bylaws, ARTICLE VIII – REGIONS, Section 1 -- Geographical Boundaries, to redefine regional boundaries and names, amend ARTICLE VI – OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS, Section 1 – Titles and ARTICLE VII – EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETINGS AND VOTING, Section 1 – Membership, to reduce the number Regional Directors from nine to six, and amend ARTICLE IV – ANNUAL AND SPECIAL MEETINGS, Section 1 – Annual Meetings, to adjust the regional names and order of meetings, as follows:

ARTICLE VIII — REGIONS

Section 1 – Geographical Boundaries

The United States, Canada, Bermuda, Mexico, Japan and Europe are divided into ~~nine (9)~~ six(6) geographical regions as follows:

REGION 1 - NORTH ATLANTIC

Bermuda, Canada (East of the 77th meridian), Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York (East of the 77th meridian), Pennsylvania (East of the 77th meridian), North Carolina, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Carolina, US Virgin Islands, and Vermont, and Virginia.

REGION 2 – NORTHWEST GREAT LAKES

Alaska, California (North of the 36th parallel), Canada (West of the Western border of Manitoba), Idaho, Montana, Nevada (North of the 37th parallel), Oregon, Utah and Washington. Alabama, Canada (East of the 90th meridian and West of the 77th meridian), Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Mississippi, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

REGION 3 - GULF SHORE MIDWEST

Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas (South of the 38th parallel), Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Tennessee (West of the Tennessee River), Texas, Wyoming, and the Mexican states of Aguascalientes, Campeche, Chiapas, Chihuahua, Coahuila, Colima, Durango, Federal District, Guanajuato, Guerrero, Hidalgo, Jalisco, México, Michoacán, Morelos, Nayarit, Nuevo Leon, Oaxaca, Puebla, Querétaro, Quintana Roo, San Luis Potosí, Tabasco, Tamaulipas, Tlaxcala, Veracruz, Yucatán, and Zacatecas. Arkansas, Canada (East of the Western border of Manitoba and West of the 90th meridian) Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and the Mexican states of Aguascalientes, Campeche, Chiapas, Chihuahua, Coahuila, Colima, Durango, Federal District, Guanajuato, Guerrero, Hidalgo, Jalisco, México, Michoacán, Morelos, Nayarit, Nuevo Leon, Oaxaca, Puebla, Querétaro, Quintana Roo, San Luis Potosí, Tabasco, Tamaulipas, Tlaxcala, Veracruz, Yucatán, and Zacatecas.

REGION 4 - GREAT LAKES WEST

Canada (East of the 90th meridian and West of the 77th meridian), Kentucky (North of the 38th parallel), Michigan, New York (West of the 77th meridian), Ohio, Pennsylvania (West of the 77th meridian), and West Virginia. Alaska, Arizona, California, Canada (West of the Western border of Manitoba), Hawaii, Idaho, Mexican states of Baja California Norte, Baja California Sur, Sinaloa, and Sonora, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington and Wyoming.

REGION 5 – SOUTHWEST

Arizona, California (South of the 36th parallel), Hawaii, Nevada (South of the 37th parallel), and the Mexican states of Baja California Norte, Baja California Sur, Sinaloa, and Sonora.

REGION 6 – MIDWEST

Canada (East of the Western border of Manitoba and West of the 90th meridian), Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas (North of the 38th parallel), Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

REGION 7 – SOUTHERN

Alabama, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky (South of the 38th parallel), Maryland, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee (East of the Tennessee River), the U.S. Virgin Islands, and Virginia.

REGION 85 - JAPAN

Japan.

REGION 96 - EUROPE

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Kosovo, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Macedonia, Malta, Monaco, Moldova, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom.

ARTICLE VI — OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS

Section 1 – Titles

The officers of this Association shall be President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer.

The Directors of this Association shall consist of ~~nine (9)~~ six (6) Regional Directors, representing the geographical regions herein specified, provided that not more than one person resident in any one of the Regions specified shall be elected a Regional Director, and five (5) Directors at Large.

No person may hold more than one office.

ARTICLE VII — EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETINGS AND VOTING

Section 1 – Membership

The government of the affairs of this Association shall be in the hands of the Executive Board. The President, the Vice President, the Secretary, the Treasurer, the ~~nine (9)~~ six (6) Regional Directors, and the five (5) Directors at Large of this Association shall be members of the Executive Board.

ARTICLE IV — ANNUAL AND SPECIAL MEETINGS

Section 1 – Annual Meetings

The Annual Meeting of the Association shall be held commencing on the third, fourth or fifth (if applicable) Friday in June, or the first Friday in July, of each year in each of the regions listed below successively (excluding the Japan and Europe regions), beginning in ~~1982~~ 2026 and in the following order:

~~West, Atlantic, Great Lakes, Midwest, Midwest, Southern, North Atlantic, Northwest, Gulf Shore, Great Lakes, Southwest.~~

There shall be no change in the order of rotation, and each time an Annual Meeting shall have been held in each of the ~~seven~~ four Regions, the order of rotation shall thereafter be repeated. A city within the eligible Region shall be chosen for the Annual Meeting to be held five years hence and announced to the delegates to the Annual Meeting of the Association. Electronic or written notice of the time and place of the Annual Meeting shall be made to member clubs by the Central Office not less than forty (40) nor more than fifty (50) days prior to the opening day of the meeting.

The Executive Board shall have authority by two-thirds (2/3rds) vote of the entire Executive Board to change the Annual Meeting date, location and/or manner of meeting if circumstances outside the control of the Association arise. Notice of such change shall be provided to member clubs by the Central Office as set forth above.

Unfinished Business and General Orders

(12) OTHER COMMITTEES.

None.

(13) NEW BUSINESS.

Ms. Anger moved that, for the Persian and Exotic Cat Club's show on April 20/21, 2024 in Hong Kong (ID), grant an exception to Show Rule 4.04 and allow a format change from 1 AB/OCP (Lee); 1 AB/SSP; 3 AB to 1 SSP/OCP (Lee); 1 AB/SSP; 3 AB. Seconded by **Mr. Currle, Withdrawn.**

Ms. Anger moved to grant an exception to Show Rule 4.04 and allow the Midwest TGIF Fanciers to change its show license to include two OCP rings using already-contracted judges at their August 3/4, 2024 show in Gray Summit, Missouri (Region 6). Scoring would be for grand points only for the op/ch and op/pr portion of the final with no points awarded in breed. If the minimum entries are not achieved, that portion of the final will not be held. Seconded by **Mr. Currle**, the motion was **ratified by unanimous consent.**

Ms. Anger moved that when a club considers hiring a guest judge to judge a CFA show, the club must first attempt to hire a licensed CFA judge residing within a 200 mile radius of the planned show, before any guest judges may be considered. The burden is on the club to provide logistical information to the Guest Judge Administrator, along with the guest judge request. Seconded by **Mr. Webb, Motion Failed.**

(14) OLD BUSINESS.

None.

(15) DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS AND SUSPENSIONS.

Disciplinary Hearings And Suspensions: Cases that have been reviewed by the Protest Committee and for which a recommendation was presented to the Board. The following case was heard, a tentative decision was rendered, timely notice was given to the parties, and no appeal and/or appeal fee was filed. Therefore, final disposition is as follows:

24-002 CFA v Yu Bing Bing & Russell Tian

Violation of CFA Bylaws Article XV, Section 4 (b, c, e, and g)

Guilty. The board has imposed the following disciplinary action: (1) one year suspension of all CFA services and a \$500.00 fine; the fine to be paid within 30 days. If the fine is not paid prior to the end of the suspension period, the suspension will continue until the fine is paid in full; (2) CFA shall void the registration of litters F4198867, F4198866, and F4198418 and the registration of all cats, kittens, and litters registered from those three litters, or any descendants of those cats, shall be re-registered as not for breeding, and flagged as not for showing. [vote sealed]

24-010 CFA v. Patrick Au

Violation of CFA Show Rules 21.02c

Guilty. The board has imposed the following disciplinary action: (1) that Respondent be and is hereby reprimanded; (2) CFA shall void the wins, points, or titles earned by the three entries in question. [vote sealed]

Appeals: Cases that have been reviewed by the Protest Committee and for which a recommendation was presented to and heard by the Board, a tentative decision was rendered, timely notice was given to the party, an appeal and/or appeal fee was timely filed, and the appeal was heard by the Board of Directors. Therefore, final disposition is as follows:

None

Board-Cited Hearing: The Board may consider any protest filed by any member of a member club or in any other manner brought to the attention of the Executive Board. The Board may delegate authority to one or more persons to review, investigate, and determine if probable cause exists for the filing of a formal protest. This case was heard on direct cite by the CFA Executive Board. Timely notice was given to the parties, and the matter was heard. Final disposition is as follows:

None

Secretary's Note: The Officers and Board of Directors of the Cat Fanciers' Association, Inc. met on Tuesday, April 2, 2024, via Zoom video conference. **President Richard Mastin** called the regularly scheduled mid-quarterly video conference meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Eastern Time. A roll call by **Secretary Rachel Anger** found the following members to be present:

Mr. Richard Mastin (President)
Mr. Russell Webb (Vice-President/Region 1 Board Liaison)
Ms. Rachel Anger (Secretary)
Ms. Kathy Calhoun (Treasurer)
Vacant (NAR Director)
Mrs. Pam Moser (NWR Director)
Ms. Paula Noble (GSR Director)
Mr. John Colilla (GLR Director)
Mr. Michael Shelton (SWR Director)
Mrs. Cathy Dunham (MWR Director)
Mr. Kenny Currie (SOR Director)
Ms. Yukiko Hayata (Japan Regional Director)
Ms. Pam DelaBar (Europe Regional Director)
Dr. Marilee Griswold (Director-at-Large)
Mr. Pauli Huhtaniemi (Director-at-Large)
Mrs. Carol Krzanowski (Director-at-Large)
Mrs. Anne Mathis (Director-at-Large)
Mr. Darrell Newkirk (Director-at-Large)

Also Present:

Edward L. Raymond, Jr., Esq., CFA Legal Counsel
Allene Tartaglia, Executive Director
James Simbro, IT Systems Analyst
Matthew Wong, ID Representative

Absent:

Eva Chen, ID-China Representative

Secretary's Note: For the ease of the reader, some items were discussed at different times but were included with their particular agenda.

Mastin: OK, Madame Secretary, please do the roll call. **Anger:** Thank you, I will. Anne Mathis will not be on the call until later. I will make a note in the minutes when she joins the call. [**Secretary's Note:** Secretary Rachel Anger called the roll, as reflected above, with the exception of Mathis, who joined the meeting later, as indicated.] OK, we are all present except Anne Mathis, who will be joining us shortly, I hope, and I'm turning it back to you, Mr. President. **Mastin:** Thank you Rachel.

TRANSCRIPT

Executive Session

(1) **APPEAL HEARING.**

[**Secretary's Note:** An appeal hearing was conducted in Executive Session. For a finding of guilty, **Motion Failed.** (vote sealed)]

Reports of Officers, Boards, and Standing Committees

(2) **APPROVE ORDERS OF THE DAY.**

| CFA EXECUTIVE BOARD Video Conference Meeting Agenda April 2, 2024 | | |
|--|------------------------------------|------------|
| Executive Session | | |
| 1. | Appeal Hearing | Raymond |
| Open Session | | |
| Reports of Officers, Boards, and Standing Committees | | |
| 2. | Approve Orders of the Day | Mastin |
| 3. | Ratification of Online Motions | Anger |
| 4. | Judging Program Report | Nye/Webb |
| 5. | Central Office Report | Tartaglia |
| 6. | Club Membership | Krzanowski |
| 7. | Show Rules | Raymond |
| 8. | International Division | Calhoun |
| 9. | Virtual Cat Competition | Kerr |
| 10. | Junior Fanciers | Shaffer |
| 11. | Experimental Formats | Anger |
| 12. | Board-Sponsored Delegate Proposals | Moser |
| Unfinished Business and General Orders | | |
| 13. | Other Committees | |
| 14. | New Business | |
| 15. | Old Business | |
| | ADJOURN OPEN SESSION | |

Mastin: Hello, and welcome everyone to the CFA’s Board of Directors April 2, 2024 board meeting. The first item on the agenda is to approve the Orders of the Day. Do we have any corrections or additions? **Anger:** As we noted earlier, I am withdrawing #12 – Registration Rule Proposal [**Secretary’s Note:** Subsequent agenda items have been renumbered]. **Mastin:** OK, thank you. Any other additions or corrections? OK, may I have a motion to approve the Orders of the Day? **Currle:** So moved. **Mastin:** Kenny thank you. May I have a second? **Krzanowski:** Carol seconds. **Mastin:** I think it was Carol. **Krzanowski:** Yes. **Mastin:** OK, thank you Carol. Any discussion? Any objections? OK, the motion passes unanimously, for the Orders of the Day.

The Orders of the Day, as amended, were accepted without objection and became the Orders of Business.

Mastin: Before we get started, I just need to make an announcement to all the board members, committee chairs and the Central Office team. We have a very full agenda this evening. We must be efficient and focused on each item that is being discussed. Do not read your report. Please get to the highlights, motions, ask questions of the board. Thank you.

Reports of Officers, Boards, and Standing Committees

(3) RATIFICATION OF ONLINE MOTIONS.

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| MOTIONS THAT REQUIRE RATIFICATION | | | |
| 1. | Executive Committee 02.01.2024 | Due to a clerk shortage, grant an exception to Show Rule 9.08.n. to allow the Alianza Felina club to ring share their 6 ring show, holding 3 rings in the morning and 3 rings in the afternoon at its show on February 3, 2024 in Malaga, Spain (Region 9). | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |
| No discussion. | | | |
| 2. | Executive Committee 02.02.2024 | For the Japan Dancing Cat Club's February 11, 2024 show in Yokohama, Japan (Region 8), grant an exception to Show Rule 5.01.m. to increase the entry limit from 120 to 130. The club will issue a new flyer, publicize the change, and send notifications to all entered exhibitors and judges. | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |
| No discussion. | | | |
| 3. | Executive Committee 02.05.2024 | Allow the Persian and Exotic Club to have one OCP Ring at its April 20/21, 2024 show in Hong Kong (International Division). The ring will use Suki Lee, an allbreed judge on the regular slate. Scoring would be for grand points only for the op/ch and op/pr portion of the final with no points awarded in breed. If the minimums entries are not achieved, that portion of the final will not be held. | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |
| No discussion. | | | |
| 4. | Executive Committee 02.08.2024 | Due to a clerk shortage and low entry, grant an exception to Show Rule 9.08.n. to allow the Pawprints in the Sand and Chamberlin on the Bay Cat Clubs to ring share their 6 ring one day show, holding 2 of its rings in the morning and 2 rings in the afternoon, with the remaining 2 rings on their regular schedule, at their show on February 10, 2024 in Newport News, Virginia (Region 7). | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |
| No discussion. | | | |
| 5. | Executive Committee 02.17.2024 | Grant an exception to Show Rule 4.14 and allow Jeri Zottoli to judge in place of Melanie Morgan at the Black Diamond Cat Club/Ramapo Cat Fanciers show February 18, 2024 in York Pennsylvania (Region 1). | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |
| Secretary's Note: The entire Board of Directors wishes Melanie a speedy recovery. | | | |
| 6. | Anger Huhtaniemi 02.19.2024 | Accept the resignation of Morning Yang as a CFA Associate Judge, effective April 30, 2024, with regret. | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |
| Secretary's Note: Discussion on this item was deemed to be Executive Session and is not included. | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 7. | Executive Committee 02.21.2024 | Grant an exception to Show Rule 9.08.n. to allow the Sunshine Cat Club to ring share at their show, consisting of an allbreed ring in the morning and a single specialty ring in the afternoon (or vice versa) at their show on March 16, 2024 in Vantaa, Finland (Region 9). | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |
| No discussion. | | | |
| 8. | Executive Committee 02.23.2024 | For its February 24/25, 2024 show in Shanghai China (ID-China), (1) grant an exception to Show Rule 4.14 and allow the Mountain City Cat Fanciers Club to change its show format from a two-day show to a back-to-back show, and (2) grant an exception to Show Rule 5.01.m. to decrease the entry limit from 450 to 225. The club will issue a new flyer, publicize the change, and send notifications to all entered exhibitors and judges. | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |
| No discussion. | | | |
| 9. | Executive Committee 02.27.2024 | Grant an exception to Show Rule 4.14 and allow the China Ace Cat Club to add a specialty ring at their March 3/4, 2024 show in Chengdu, China (ID-China), changing the show license from 6 AB/3 SP to 6 AB/4 SP. | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |
| Calhoun: Fortunately, John and I are on the same flight back from Shanghai and were able to discuss. We have no issue with this. I don't think Matt and Wain will object but would like to hear from them as well. Harding: I have no problem with this. Wong: I am OK with this. | | | |
| 10. | Executive Committee 02.29.2024 | Allow the United Feline Odyssey club to have 2 OCP Rings (one each day) at their April 6/7, 2024 show in Hong Kong (International Division). The rings are stand-alone, using judges on the regular slate. Scoring would be for grand points only for the op/ch and op/pr portion of the final with no points awarded in breed. If the minimum entries are not achieved, that portion of the final will not be held. | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |
| No discussion. | | | |
| 11. | Executive Committee 03.05.2024 | For its March 16, 2024 show in LiaoCheng Shandong, China (ID-China), grant the China Brilliant Cat Club an exception to Judging Program Rule 12.4.b. and allow Jorgen Billing to guest judge in place of Nancy Dodds. | Motion Failed. |
| <p>Nye (via Anger): I am not supportive of this request. This is a show rule violation on two fronts:</p> <p>3.01 A member club must not call upon persons who are not on the CFA judges list for judging engagements without first having secured approval from the Guest Judge Administrator of the Judging Program.</p> <p>And.</p> <p>3.02 c. Invitations from CFA clubs for non-CFA Judges are subject to the approval of the CFA Judging Program Committee, excluding those for Guest Judges at the Approved Guest Judge Level, and may be considered only by Approved Allbreed, Approval Pending Allbreed or Approved Specialty Judges whose license from an accepted association is on file with the Judging Program Committee and who have been actively judging with their parent association for a</p> | | | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|--|--------------------|--|------|
| | | <p>minimum of five (5) years. A Judge may only judge the level at which they are licensed. When the show format includes a specialty ring, guest judges will serve as a specialty judge in CFA shows unless a specialty-only CFA judge would be serving as the required specialty judge. Only a licensed CFA judge or a guest judge at the Approved Guest Judge Level may judge a Super Specialty ring. Requests for guest judge approval must be submitted to the Judging Program Committee at least 60 days in advance of the show. Requests submitted with less than 60 days remaining until the proposed show date will not be considered. Approval from the Judging Program Committee is no longer required for a club to contract a Guest Judge at the Approved Guest Judge level.</p> <p>We do not have a resume on file for Jorgen Billing, or has he ever judged for CFA. By the time this gets licensed, and the email goes to Jorgen with CFA show rules, Standards. Code of Ethics, this Guest Judge will have little to no time to review any of this. We have enough trouble with clubs following the show rules with regard to Guest Judging, climate control etc., by approving a blatant disregard for the rules, it just rewards them for having skirting the approved process. Howe was well aware of the rules as he had previously contacted Wendy Heidt, Guest Judge Administrator for this same show.</p> <p>This club only contracted CFA Judge, Nancy Dodds in the last 5 weeks, and due to the high airfare was not going to be feasible. Acting on the advise of a non-CFA Judge to contract a FiFe guest judge without contacting the CFA Guest Judge Administrator, was ill advised. This is typical of China clubs now, contracting judges and licensing shows at the last minute.....</p> <p>This brings to mind the cliché—it's easy to ask forgiveness than to get permission.</p> <p>Webb: According to show rule3.02c this request is less the 60 days and we do not have a resume on file for Jorgen. Wendy was not contacted about this guest judge. I'm on the fence with this request. Currle: According to my limited research, who is an allbreed fife judge from Denmark. Before you write him off, perhaps a phone call To Pam DelaBar may be appropriate. I'm sure that her partner would be aware of this gentleman's abilities. I don't think it's right to assume that every clubs attempt to replace a judge Should be viewed as an attempt to skirt rules. Mastin: In addition to hearing from Pam DelaBar, we should hear from Kathy Calhoun, Mathew Wong and John Colilla. Can we obtain the date as to when Nancy Dodds notified the club she had to cancel? Can we also get the date when the club secured Jorgen Billing? Calhoun: I heard about this a little shortly before the motion from Rachel. The club did not reach out to the ID committee for direction. I will reach out to the team but feedback will not likely be in the next 24 hours. May I ask who initiated this request? [Anger provided the email address] Thank you I will pass that along to the committee members. Webb: I will ask Nancy what date she was asked. I know Nancy told them that the airfare was too high and she could not do the show. Webb: Just heard back from Nancy she signed the contract on January 23 and on February 26 she told him that the airfare was to expensive and he should find another judge. Anger: Russell is correct. Wendy spent considerable time in January going over the entire guest judge process with the club and provided the list of CFA-approved guest judges. If we make an exception now, it would be unfair to deny any future club making the same request, and then we have chaos. While my heart goes out to the club, I must support the Guest Judge Administrator, the Judging Program Rules and the Show Rules. Anger: That corresponds with the date the club requested help finding a CFA judge. No responses were received. Here is the ISO:</p> <p><i>Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 at 04:23:11 PM EST</i> <i>Subject: ISO Judge for China Show March 16, 2024</i></p> <p><i>A club in China has had a judge cancellation for March 16, 2024. The trip is to Beijing, followed by a high-speed train ride. If you are available and willing to make the trip, please respond privately with your availability and estimated air fare to Beijing.</i></p> <p>Mastin: Have you received any information from the Team? If no one objects we can keep the discussion open till 7:37 am ET on March 5th in an effort for Kathy to obtain information from her team. Does anyone object to keeping the motion open till 7:37 am ET tomorrow (Tuesday 3/5)? Calhoun: I have not heard from all the committee members that are involved with China. That being said, the majority of the committee members are not in favor of the motion. Mastin: Kathy, Thank you for your quick response. Based on your response I see no need to wait till tomorrow to call for the vote.</p> | |

| | Moved/ Seconded | Motion | Vote |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| 12. | Executive Committee 03.05.2024 | Reconsider the previous motion. | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |
| No discussion. | | | |
| 13. | Anger | For its March 16, 2024 show in LiaoCheng Shandong, China (ID-China), grant the China Brilliant Cat Club an exception to Judging Program Rule 12.4.b. and Show Rules 3.01 and 3.02.c., and allow Jorgen Billing to guest judge in place of Nancy Dodds. | Motion Failed. |
| Secretary's Note: Discussion on this item was moved to Executive Session and is not included. | | | |
| 14. | Executive Committee 03.18.2024 | For the Delaware River Cats' proposed show scheduled April 13/14, 2024 in Region 1, grant an exception to Show Rule 4.04 (second paragraph) and allow the show to be licensed with less than 30 days remaining prior to the opening day of the show. | Motion Failed. Anger, Calhoun and Webb abstained for conflict. |
| Currle: Show Rules should prevail here. | | | |
| 15. | Executive Committee 03.20.2024 | Reconsider the previous motion. | Motion Carried (subject to ratification). |
| No discussion. | | | |
| 16. | Executive Committee 03.21.2024 | For the Delaware River Cats' proposed show scheduled April 13/14, 2024 in Region 1, grant an exception to Show Rule 4.04 (second paragraph) and allow the show to be licensed with less than 30 days remaining prior to the opening day of the show. | Motion Failed. Anger, Calhoun and Webb abstained. |
| <p>Emergency online motions are decided by the Executive Committee (EC) of the Board. The EC consists of the four officers and Kenny Currle. Pursuant to New York law, online motions must be passed unanimously; a single vote of “no” or an abstention without cause by a member of the EC will cause the motion to fail.</p> <p>The initial motion to waive SR 4.04 and allow Delaware River Cat Club to license its show less than 30 days before the opening day of the show failed, with three members of the EC abstaining for cause and two voting “no.”</p> <p>After that vote, numerous emails were received asking that the decision be appealed to the full Board. While there is no right to appeal from the EC’s decision on an online motion, the EC passed a motion to reconsider its prior decision so that input could be solicited from the full Board. Some but not all Board members offered their input with only one Board member indicating support for extending the licensing deadline. At the close of the comment period, the initial motion to waive the deadline found in SR 4.04 was brought before the EC once again. The results of this EC vote were the same as the initial vote.</p> | | | |

Mastin: OK, we’re going to move on to the second agenda item, and that is Ratification of Online Motions, Rachel? **Anger:** My motion is to ratify Items 1-10, also 12 and 15. Those are the motions that carried in our online motions. **Currle:** Kenny seconds. **Mastin:** Thank you Kenny. Discussion?

DelaBar: I would like to correct #13. The motion failed, and secondly, I would like to move that the discussion be placed in executive session. **Mastin:** Rachel, do you have any

comments? **Anger:** Yes. In the Arial font that I used here, which I used for executive session, it should not be appearing here. I'm not the one who compiled the final reports, so I apologize for that appearing. **Currle:** I'll second Pam's motion. **Anger:** I will note for historical purposes that it failed. **Mastin:** I've got Pam DelaBar making the motion, Kenny seconded. Is there any further discussion? Any objections to Pam's motion? OK, that motion passes unanimously. [**Secretary's Note:** Both requests in the motion already existed, so this motion was not needed.]

The primary amendment to the main motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Mastin: Any other discussion? Any other objections? Seeing no objections, the motion passes unanimously.

The main motion, as amended, is ratified by unanimous consent.

Mastin: Thank you Rachel.

(4) JUDGING PROGRAM REPORT.

Executive Committee

Co-Chair: Vicki Nye
Board Liaison and Co-Chair: Russell Webb
Advisor/Coordinator: Rachel Anger

List of Committee Members:

Rachel Anger: Associate Program Applications Administrator
Anne Mathis: Associate Program Training Administrator, Education – Judges’ Training/Tests and Continuing Education
Nancy Dodds: File Administrator
Marilee Griswold: File Administrator
Leslie Carr: Application Administrator – Regions 1-9
Jodell Raymond: Application Administrator – International Division
Barbara Jaeger: Education – Breed Awareness & Orientation
Wendy Heidt: Guest Judge Administrator
Teresa Sweeney: Recruitment, Development and Mentoring Administrator
Diana Rothermel: Ombudsperson

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

Since the February 3-4, 2024 Board meeting, several topics have been brought to the Judging Program Committee to discuss and provide a possible solution. These issues or topics were discussed on the Judging Program email list, and again at our March 25th, 2024 Judging Program Committee Meeting.

- Establishment of a JPC Sub-Committee to review and provide recommendations on Judges Social Media activity.*
- The unintended deletion of breed council membership to the breeder stream judging program application requirement.*
- Approved Guest Judge 2 tier status, no requirements for judging or license to remain as an Approved Guest Judge*
- Putting a sunset date on the current T1, T2, T3 Associate Judging Program at 5 years from May 1, 2024.*

Current Happenings Of Committee:

Leave of Absence:

None

Retirements/Resignations:

On March 18, 2024, the Judging Program Committee received the retirement letter of Kayoko Koizumi effective March 31, 2024, and regretfully accepted. Kayoko bred Persians under the Laves prefix with an impressive history of 58 Grands and 4 Distinguished Merit cats. Kayoko began judging for CFA in 1994 and judged worldwide for 30 years. In addition to her service to CFA in the Judging Program, Kayoko served as Japan Regional Director for 6 terms, June 2002 through June 2006, June 2010 through June 2014 and June 2017 through June 2020 leading a fairly new region into a robust region with enough shows for Japanese exhibitors to obtain National wins in Region 1-9 standings. Kayoko was very giving of her knowledge and talent in the judging ring, training nearly every Japanese Judge since 2003. Kayoko also served several years on the Protest Committee. When leaving her CFA Board seat after one of her Regional Director terms, Pam DelaBar, as CFA President, noted that “Kayoko was very instrumental for Japan in January 1995, when a devastating earthquake hit Kobe and Kayoko helped direct relief efforts for animals in Kobe”. The CFA Judging Program thanks Kayoko Koizumi for her 30 years of judging service and 11 years as Regional Director for Japan.

Morning Yang, CFA Associate Judge as of November 2020, from China, submitted her resignation from the Associate Judging program on February 14, 2024, effected April 24, 2024.

On March 20, 2024, the Judging Program Committee received the resignation of Iris Zinck, dated March 18, 2024. CFA has accepted the resignation of Iris Zinck as a CFA Allbreed Judge in good standing.

Mastin: Moving on to our fourth agenda item, is the Judging Program. Allene, do you have Vicki present? **Tartaglia:** Yes. I just promoted her to panelist. **Mastin:** OK, Vicki and Russell, you have this report. Identify who is going to take us through the report quickly. **Webb:** Vicki. **Mastin:** Who is? **Webb:** Vicki. **Mastin:** Vicki is, OK. **Nye:** I’m on and duly noted that I will take you through this quickly. **Mastin:** OK, thank you Vicki. **Nye:** Sure. I’m assuming you all read all the introductory information that we’ve got here. What I’m going to present, briefly mention that we’ve got the retirement of Kayoko Koizumi, Morning Yang and Iris Zinck.

Applications and Advancements:

Applications:

None.

Advancements:

Two Regular Judging Program advancements to be presented in closed session.

Advancements – Regular Judging Program:

Advance from Longhair Trainee to Longhair Apprentice (1st Specialty):

Alex Chun Lap (Hong Kong)

16 yes (Mathis did not vote)

Advance from Apprentice Shorthair to Approval Pending Shorthair (2nd Specialty):

Mie Takahashi (Hyogo, Japan)

16 yes (Mathis did not vote)

Nye: Two advancements.

Elevation to Emeritus Status:

Kayoko Koizumi (1993)

Vote sealed

Restored to Guest Judge Roster:

Dmitriy Gubenko

Cherkassy, Cherkas'Ka Oblast', Ukraine

Jurgen Trautmann

Daxberg Mömbris, Germany

[From end of meeting] **Mastin:** Rachel, do we have anything else? **Anger:** I have the votes to announce. That's it. I have sent it out in an email, but I can certainly announce it if I can get it called up here. **Mastin:** Rachel, are you ready? **Anger:** Yes. Alex and Mie were advanced unanimously. Koizumi was elevated to Judge Emeritus status. **Mastin:** OK, very good. Thank you for doing that.

Social Media Policy Subcommittee Update

Members: *Marilee Griswold, Michael Shelton, Pam DelaBar, Teresa Sweeney, Linda Komar*

The Social Media Committee formed with 3 board members, 3 judges and 1 exhibitor member (5 total members). We collected data from various similar organizations regarding social media policies. We also presented a poll to our CFA constituents. The results of the poll were made available to the board.

The original Social Media policy included board and committee members as well as judges. It was clear with the poll results that the main concern revolves around Judges in this realm. Because of this, we felt it prudent to merge the SM policy into the Judges Code of Ethics and no longer include board members or committee members. This is similar to several other dog and cat fancier organizations. In addition, when reading the Judges Code of Ethics and the SM policy, it was clear that there was already much overlap.

Some of the verbiage and decisions on the committee were easily agreed upon, especially based on the poll results. Judges should not post photos of cats currently exhibiting or of their owners or awards (singling out particular cats or owners). We easily removed the prohibition for not recognizing individuals or club members who put on the show (general thank you for well-run show). The biggest disagreement was in regards to allowing judges to post photos of their own cats on social media, whether at home or in a show environment. The poll was also pretty mixed with responses on these questions. In the end, 3 of our committee members felt judges should be allowed to do this (2 in dissension).

Another issue that was discussed and carried 100% agreement was with regards to enforcement of this policy. It was felt by some that they were being ‘singled out’ with regards to their SM postings. Keeping in mind that someone may only ‘see’ the Facebook/SM postings of friends or people they ‘follow’ it may very well appear to some that they are “picked on” regarding their postings while others are completely ignored. Because of this perception, the committee feels that this policy, like all other policies in CFA, be enforced when a complaint arises in particular and not be “policed” by the JPC. Discussion regarding the integrity and trust of our judging panel was forefront with this point.

*In the document, words that are ~~struck out~~ were removed from the original Code of Ethics and words that are **bolded** were what we added.*

Thank you for allowing us an attempt to hammer this out. The board can, of course, accept the new Judges Code of Ethics, reject our recommendation and keep the current SM policy or completely remove the SM policy altogether. This is our best approximation of a compromise.

*Respectfully
Marilee Griswold, MD*

Judges’ Code of Ethics

Preamble

The Cat Fanciers’ Association, Inc. (“CFA”) is a not-for-profit association created to register pedigreed cats, sanction CFA’s clubs, shows and events, protect the hobby of breeding and showing pedigreed cats, and enhance the well-being of all cats. CFA Judges officiate at CFA shows to evaluate cats using CFA standards and policies.

CFA Judges are Ambassadors for CFA to the cat fancy and public. A CFA judge must embody and project unwavering integrity, dedication and ethical behavior that protects the reputation of fair, honest and educated judging. All CFA Judges affirm their endorsement of this code and acknowledge their commitment to uphold its principles and obligations by accepting and maintaining their license in the CFA Judging Program. ~~With common sense, judges can avoid situations which might raise ethical questions.~~

The following Code also applies to Social Media, which includes not only text, but also photographs, audio, video and any combinations of these. Social media communications should be regarded as public at all times, even if created with private intentions. If you are going to use social media, recognize that your communications might be read by anyone at any time, and that postings on the internet may be permanent. Commenting on lists or any other internet communication reaching multiple individuals, excluding your private email, is considered use of social media. “Re-tweeting” or clicking on the “like”, “share” or similar buttons on someone else’s social media comment is interpreted as commenting.

Judges' Code of Ethics

CFA Judges shall at all times abide by and conform to the following code of conduct in their capacity as judges:

- *Abide in all respects ~~to~~ **by** the rules and regulations including but not limited to CFA's By-Laws, Show Rules, and Judging Program Rules.*
- *Conduct themselves in and out of the ring with honesty, integrity, due diligence, and competence as Ambassadors of CFA.*
- *Carry out all obligations to the best of their ability including, but not limited to, their responsibilities to the clubs who employ their services, exhibitors who entrust their cats into their hands, breeders who look to them for advice, and to the cats themselves.*
- *Base all judging decisions firmly on condition and the standards for each breed. Evaluate the exhibits strictly, fairly and impartially, in accordance with the accepted standard for each breed. **Do not put yourself in a position where you give the impression that you have given up your impartiality.***
- *Participate in continuing education, and keep current in the standards and rules in a manner that will allow judges to render an educated opinion which exhibitors will seek out.*
- *Communicate with the public, exhibitors, breeders, fellow judges, and club members in a responsible, respectful, and professional manner. **Promote your participation in the cat fancy in a positive light and with a general feeling of pride and professionalism.***
- *~~Not~~ **Do not** engage in or facilitate any discriminatory or harassing behavior toward CFA staff, CFA board members or officers, club members, exhibitors, breeders, or others in the context of activities relating to CFA. **Positive and promoting comments regarding a show, CFA and club members are encouraged.***
- *Act at all times in the best interests of CFA and not for personal or third-party gain or financial enrichment. Avoid placing, or the appearance of placing, one's own self-interest or any third-party interest above that of CFA. **Posting photos of your own cats is allowed on social media except for those cats/kittens currently being exhibited.***
- *~~Not~~ **Do not** solicit or accept gifts, gratuities, personal property, or any other item of value from any person as a direct or indirect inducement to provide special treatment to the donor in matters relating to CFA. Never accept any gifts suspected to be inappropriate.*
- *Never solicit judging assignments.*
- *~~Not~~ **Do not** criticize by act or word the work of other CFA judges. ~~Not~~ **Do not** offer criticism of any previously judged cat(s) to anyone including other officiating judges during the course of a show. **Avoid any situations where you single out a specific animal or breeder, whether it be a cat currently showing, or one that may be in the future.***

- *Advise potential exhibitors not to show their cats in their ring when doing so might give the impression of unfair advantage. For example, if the exhibitor is: Their employer or an employee. A relative. A member of their household.*
- *Respect and work together with the CFA Judging Program Committee, the CFA Board of Directors, fellow judges, clerks and stewards, and especially the clubs who hire them, in a spirit of cooperation and harmony.*
- *Provide proper care for their cats and maintain them in an exemplary manner beyond CFA's Minimum Cattery Standards.*
- *Honor and respect the CAT.*

Nye: The first item of business that we have a motion on is the Social Media Committee and the Social Media Guidelines. The Committee was set up by Marilee. She selected a diverse group, including board members, Judging Program members and exhibitors. They polled the exhibitors and anyone that was interested in responding. What they came up with is a solution that I think is excellent. It's streamlined. It removed the Social Media Guidelines and included the important parts that we wanted to move over to the Code of Ethics. There was the removal of anything that had to do with board members, committee members or references to pointing out individuals. That was not important to those that answered the poll. Keep scrolling down Allene, thank you. Those items that are lined through were removed. Those items that are bolded are new items. It's important to note that there is not a huge amount of change to what judges are permitted to do. They still cannot post photos of cats that are currently being shown and judges that are exhibiting can post photos of their own cats, but not of ones that are currently being shown. There was also one line taken out that was rather condescending to the judges. It says, *With common sense, judges can avoid situations which might raise ethical questions.* Those are the highlights. Marilee, since she was the subchair of this committee, would you like to bring anything forward, or are there any questions? **Griswold:** Yes, I'll take any questions on this. We really kind of – anything that was very heavily weighted from one side to the other with our poll we either removed or included as needed. Like Vicki said, it appeared that the restrictions on board members and committee members was not incredibly important to most of our constituents. This is really a judge problem, so moving it into the Code of Ethics actually is very similar to several other associations. The AKC, FIFe, WCF – all of those have it in either the judges' code of ethics or the judging program rules. So, of course the board has the option to approve what we came up with, to leave the previous policy as it was or to do away with the social media policy altogether. Of course, that's up to you. This is our best guesstimate with some sort of a compromise and response to our poll.

Motion: *Remove the Social Media Guidelines as a stand-alone document from the CFA website and approve the revised Judges Code of Ethics which incorporates the social media policy for judges.*

Mastin: Thank you Marilee. Kenny has a question. **Currle:** Actually, I have two things. First of all, I would like to thank the committee who worked on this. You did an excellent job. It did clarify a lot of areas that were gray. Having said that, I fully support this. I would like to make the motion now to accept this as policy in CFA. **Mastin:** OK Kenny, you jumped ahead of

me a little bit here. I was going to ask Russell, are you a standing motion on all the motions under Judging Program? **Webb:** Yes. **Mastin:** OK. Marilee, do you want to second this motion, since you were the primary driver behind it? **Griswold:** Sure, I'll second it. **Mastin:** OK. Kenny, I'm going to accept Russell's standing motion, as Co-Chair of the Program. **Currle:** I understand. You're the President and that makes sense. **Mastin:** OK, thank you Kenny. Does anybody else have any additional questions for Marilee? Mike Shelton, I see you were part of this committee. Do you have any comments? **Shelton:** I think Marilee covered it pretty well. **Mastin:** Pam DelaBar, you were also part of the committee. Do you have any comments? **DelaBar:** No, I have nothing else to add. **Mastin:** OK, is there any further discussion on the motion? Any objections? Seeing no objections, the motion passes unanimously.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Mastin: OK Vicki, continue. **Nye:** I would like to thank Marilee and her committee for a great job.

JUDGING PROGRAM RULE CHANGES

Motion: *Adopt the following Judging Program rule changes, effective immediately.*

- *New Judging Program Rule 5.4 would sunset the current Associate Judging Program for T1, T2 and T3 (China, Singapore/Malaysia/Indonesia/Thailand, Hong Kong, South Korea & Region 9), at 5 years from May 1, 2024. This means current Associate Judges would need to complete their regular Judging Program requirements and apply for their first specialty by February 2029. This would not close the door permanently to a new Associate Judging Program if future country lockdowns or pandemics occur. The Board would of course have the ability to establish another Associate Judging Program. The current Associate Judges, many of whom have either already applied to CFA's regular Judging Program or are currently working on requirements (Marking a Judges Book, showing other breeds in their specialty) need to have a positive path to the regular judging program. T1 China Associate Judges accepted 10 in the program and began judging December 2020. Two of these have moved through acceptance in the Regular Judging Program in the Specialty they were accepted as an Associate Judge, one more has applied to be decisioned at the June 2024 Board Meeting, and a fourth has resigned. This leaves six remaining of the T1 China Associate Judges. Three of these are actively working on their regular application requirements, though two have not judged in the last year. The T2 Associate Judges from Singapore/Thailand/Indonesia/Malaysia program originally accepted 20 and could judge December 2021. Six have resigned, and five have applied and are either now training or actively judging for CFA. Several of the remaining nine are working on their requirements (doing cattery visits, showing other breeds in their specialty) though one has not judged since October of 2022. In China T2 December 2021, 10 were accepted, 2 have never judged, and 1 has only judged once. It is time to encourage those that want to move on in the judging program and eliminate those that only want the title or status of Associate Judge without serving their area as a judge.*

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Section 5 - REQUIREMENTS FOR ASSOCIATE JUDGES FOR APPLICATION TO THE CFA REGULAR JUDGING PROGRAM | CFA Judging Program Committee | |
| Existing Wording | Proposed Wording | |
| None. | <u>5.4 The Associate Judging Program will no longer exist as of May 1, 2029.</u> | |
| <p>RATIONALE: The Associate Judging Program was initially put in place to allow CFA to continue to produce cat shows in China during the COVID Pandemic. Nearly all training was executed via ZOOM and breed knowledge was only taught in the breeds common to that particular country or country group. This program was extended to the ID in Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore and Indonesia also during the time when neither US or R 9 judges could enter these countries. Eventually, the Associate Program was offered to other ID countries and Region 9, and trainees were accepted from Hong Kong, South Korea, Finland, Germany, Spain and Italy. The Associate Judging Program was never intended as a permanent program and efforts have been continuing to encourage Associate Judges to meet the requirements and application into the regular CFA judging program. This sunset date gives the Associate Judges 5 years to complete their requirements and apply to their first or 2nd Specialty in the regular CFA Judging Program</p> | | |

Statement from Associate Judge Subcommittee Chair: As Chair of the Associate Program and a CFA Board member, I am opposed to the 5 year sunset of the Associate Judging program for a number of reasons.

- *The clubs in Asia are still using these judges regularly, as they provide financial savings for the clubs. The clubs have a choice as to whether they use them or not, and I feel giving them the choice is important. I have judged recently in China, where these clubs employed Associate Judges, and I was told they would wish to continue to have that as a choice. Particularly in a time where we are trying to increase Chinese registrations, it seems like we would want to encourage clubs to put on shows whenever possible, hopefully increasing the exhibitor base and registrations. I would think we want to do everything possible to encourage our Chinese breeders to register kittens, and more shows mean more chances to exhibit their kittens and cats.*
- *Several of the associates are working on their applications for the regular program, but when you add in the English speaking requirement, we add a major challenge when learning the language becomes a necessity for those who aren't English speakers. After they are accepted, the Chinese trainees can't train in China, so we again add difficulty, not to mention time and expense.*
- *If the CFA Board feels that we need to set a date to sunset this program, I would suggest a minimum of 10 years, which gives these Associates, who have kept Asia going through some very tough times, a few more years to complete their application requirements thoroughly.*

Nye: The next item has to do with Judging Program rule changes and this specifically is regarding the Associate Judges. In 2020, we started accepting Associate Judges. Ultimately, we ended up with 56 Associate Judges accepted; however, we are now down to 40. We have 2 more that have applied to the Judging Program, which will take it down to 38 and another half dozen that are either marking their judges' book or have, and moving forward to go through the regular Program. The Judging Program Committee has received numerous comments from exhibitors regarding the Associate Program, they feel that the Associate Judges should run through the same training program, or should go through the same training program as the rest of the judges, with one-on-one handling, They need to be aware of all the show rules and it's time to encourage them all to move to the regular Judging Program. I think just with the attrition that we've had and the interest of them improving themselves and moving to the regular Judging Program rather than just having the Zoom training, that it's very positive for many of them. I don't think they would take it as a slap in the face. I think it's more of, we have full support of them moving forward and becoming full-fledged CFA judges with the ability to take on a second specialty and ultimately move to allbreed. **Mastin:** May I have a second on this motion? **Griswold:** I'll second. **Mastin:** Thank you Marilee.

DelaBar: I don't want to do away with anything at this point in time that is something that the clubs can use to save money. It's expensive to consistently bring in judges from outside of the area. It's premature right now, especially for my area where we just got started. I want to say something about the training. We did have some hands-on training, especially in Thailand for all the Thai associates. Whenever I asked, especially at small shows, to be able to help train an Associate, I was turned down, especially like in Korea where it was all of maybe 59 entries. We could have had excellent training there and I was not allowed to do so, so I took my time the following day and did training on my own. I don't want to see us lose an asset right now and I believe by putting a date when we're going to get rid of the Program really is a morale – definitely not a morale booster, but definitely it is a negative to the morale of the current Associate Judges who have not yet decided, and that's over 50%. **Calhoun:** I'll try to be brief. I agree with Pam. I want to speak to the Associate Program and the people that participate in it in China. If we sunset this Program, first of all it has been said before but I'll say it again. This is the team that got us through COVID in one piece and for that we should be eternally – underscore/bold, **enterally grateful** for that. With rising costs of air fares, it is increasingly difficult for clubs throughout the ID to put on shows if they have to bring in judges from other parts of the world, being U.S., Europe, whatever. It is cost prohibitive and these people that have served us as Associates would certainly be great candidates to be judges in competing registries, of which I believe right now there are 14 in China alone. I think this would be a huge mistake, and I would challenge the comment that we encourage the Associate Judges to move into the normal, regular training program for judges, because as I said I believe before, we have set up barriers, not bridges. We have said that you have to be able to speak English. We have said that trainees cannot train in China. So, this is not encouraging. This is expensive. It certainly doesn't embrace, we want you to come over and succeed. I think this would be detrimental to the Program. We should not be doing anything at this point in time that would reduce our footprint anywhere, and this certainly would. Thank you. **Anger:** Continuing what Kathy said, we have already experienced some of our Associate Judges going to other associations and publicly thanking CFA for the great training, so we should have taken a lesson from that. Our Associate Judges are very valuable. Anne Mathis, the subchair of this subcommittee, provided a detailed statement and also wanted to mention that, "regarding the training, she has had judges that have

offered to work with these Associate Judges many times and was told no by the current and former JPC Chair because they weren't 'real trainees'. In some cases we were able to get someone with one-on-one training at the close of the show, but they could have had more training, but that was denied." If training is the issue, we can certainly resolve that very simply. My statement over and over during the discussion in committee on this issue was, what is the productive purpose of sunsetting the Program? There is none. Thank you.

Moser: I support this. I think it's totally reasonable. It's 5 years out. That gives them plenty of time to meet the Program needs. I was able to train with an Associate Judge and I think that it's imperative that they get the hands-on training of a judge. I find that they sometimes acquire bad habits by not having that experience of a judge, so I think that it's totally reasonable. This is 5 years out, so within that time they can at least have their application in to become a judge.

Currle: I just had a quick question for Vicki. Was the Judging Program Committee, was this a unanimous decision or was it split? **Nye:** It was split. **Currle:** I don't need a number, I just want to know. It wasn't close. **Griswold:** When we discussed this, of course this is a charged situation because we've got variable people in this program, people who are 100% committed to CFA and judge every chance they can get, people who have never actually judged a show in the Program, people who have dropped out of the Program, and people who love it so much that they're applying to the regular Program. So, of course, we've got the entire gambit of people in this Program and I do think that, at least my original impression was that this was never a program that was going to be something that would take the place of a CFA judge, that this was a placeholder and we didn't really have a good sense of where it would go in the end. Now that COVID restrictions are gone, here we are wondering what are we going to do. I think 5 years, this is kind of what the Judging Program Committee discussion was. There are some people that are near and dear to our hearts in this Program that have helped us and continue to help us, but 5 years is quite a long time. We're not sunsetting the Program right now. Five years is quite a long time for these people to gather the requirements necessary to just apply for the Program. I think for some of those, if they need an extra year or two, we could make exceptions as that's needed. I don't want to say these are not invaluable people, because there are some that are absolutely near and dear and valuable to us, so we don't want to lose those people. I don't think we will, because most of those are pretty married to us, as we are to them, so hopefully they can – and I think most of them are, gathering their requirements for the Program and will be a part of our esteemed judging panel.

Calhoun: I have a question. When we started the Associate Judges Program, were these people told that they were just a stop gap to get us through COVID? That's a simple yes or no.

Mastin: Rachel, do you know the answer to that question? I know you have your hand up.

Anger: I do. There was no thought at that time about a time limit. That really wasn't a consideration, so I don't think it was an intentional thing that we kept it open. We were looking at an immediate solution, which we got. **Mastin:** Rachel, did you have your hand up for another reason? **Anger:** No, but I did want to mention that in Anne's explanation regarding putting the requirements together, some of the requirements that these people are putting together include learning English, so that is not a small requirement. My biggest concern is, what do we do the next time we're faced with a similar situation that caused us to have the Associate Program in the first place? What do we do? Do we ask these people, "Oh, we need you again. Can you come

back?" I don't think that's going to fly. It does no harm keeping this Program going. As Marilee pointed out, they are very dear to us. Kathy pointed out they helped us in a pinch. I'm totally supporting continuation of this Program with no sunset date. Thank you. **Mastin:** Russell, do you have any comments? **Webb:** My decision is, too, to support this Program. They're doing a good job. They are dedicated, most of them, and I think eventually they will go into the Program. If we do cut it off in 5 years, I think some of them can't make it. They don't have the money to – at this point, I spoke to a few of them. To stop in 5 years, I think it's unfair to them. That's my comment. **Newkirk:** I have a question. Are we going to be accepting new applicants as Associate Judges? **Mastin:** Vicki and Russell, do you want to address that question? Either one. **Nye:** Not to my knowledge. That's a decision for the board to make. If we have another pandemic or some other emergency where a country is closed down and CFA cannot survive there, it will be up to the board whether they want to open up another Associate Judging Program. That's actually stated in my rationale for what I put forward here. I just wanted to mention that in the T1 judges, there were 10 accepted. We are down to 7, and of those 7, 3 of them have not judged for a year. Another one has applied to the Program and another one has gone through the BAOS and working toward their requirements. So, we're down to very few in the first judges that were 2020. In the second group, the T2 China group, there are 2 that have never judged and 1 that has judged once, and that was back in 2022. I do believe that it would benefit them to know and get them assigned to mentors, to get them moved along in this Program. By the time 5 years rolls around, the T1 judges will have been onboard for 9 years.

DelaBar: This is not just a pandemic program. I has now become one that is economic and helps clubs. This is what we're supposed to be doing, is helping clubs put on shows to promote CFA, and it's just another resource for our clubs at this point in time. **Calhoun:** I agree with Pam on that point, that this is an economic necessity and the data that Vicki just ran through only proves a point that organically people who are not really committed will either not get assignments because of their talent or will no longer participate. Those who are talented and who are getting assignments would organically want to become allbreed judges. There is no need for the Program to sunset, to make this happen. **Mastin:** I have a couple questions. I'm going to start with Matthew. Matthew, if this motion was to pass, does this create a hardship where we see Associate Judges resigning from the Program? **Wong:** Thanks Rich. I think if this fell out, definitely for the community in the ID, there would be hard feelings definitely, especially in China. More importantly, especially looking at the show schedule in April, we don't have enough judges right now. Like you said, it's 5 years but these Associate Judges are extremely valuable resources and pool of stand-by that we can make use of in April. We see the overall demography in the judges in Japan and in U.S. I think as Pam and Rachel and Kathy Calhoun said, there's no need to sunset this and making an announcement. Eventually, the best will stay and some of them will be fading. Sorry, yes it will create very hard feelings among those who have been working hard for us and I think among a lot of the clubs, as well, because the AJ's are very useful. Thank you. **Mastin:** Pam DelaBar, same question to you. **DelaBar:** I'm sorry, I was writing some notes down. What was your question, Rich? **Mastin:** If this motion was to pass, would it create a hardship for your Associate Judges in Region 9? Will they decide to resign? **DelaBar:** I honestly do not know. I just know that they consider it sort of a slap in the face now that they're just getting started. Our clubs are using them. I have one more that needs to come forward, but as I said, this is a resource for the clubs. Ours have been, so far, very well received. **Mastin:** Russell, I need clarification from you. Are you in support of this motion or are you in support of continuing the Program as is, and not have a sunset? **Webb:** I'm in support of

continuing the Program, as is. **Mastin:** As is, so you're not in support of the motion? **Webb:** No. **Mastin:** OK, thank you for clarifying that. Question to Russell and Vicki. Is, by chance, the training requirement not to be done in China and also the requirement to speak English creating a bit of a hardship in trying to get the Associate Judges into the CFA regular Judging Program? Vicki, you can answer first, then Russell. **Nye:** After the T1 judges, the requirements that Anne wrote were that all judges, they needed to speak English. Apparently, there were several of them that applied that didn't actually speak English and we've been told that several of them are learning English. Most of them that I have talked to, and I have actually had phone conversations with some of these people, not just text messaging. They speak well enough to get through the training program. I don't expect for them to hold a long conversation about anything but get through a training in the ring. So, speaking English was something that has always been required. Regarding the training of them, they turned them down for training before, for actual color class training, before I came on as Co-Chair. Now we're at the position that, if we offer training, we should really offer it to everyone and that is going to create a hardship to the training program right now, trying to get any of the T1 or T2 judges to have color classes in China. If we offer it to some, we need to offer it to all of them, so that's one reason why it wasn't moved forward. There was some casual training that occurred after judging, maybe 15-20 minutes of handling. I worked with one of the European Associate Judges at a show on handling, helping them with a video also, but a full-fledged training program, that's very different than the training that they had where you speak with a judge, you handle cats with them and evaluate cats together. A lot of these people were excited about the Judging Program before the Associate Program came along. **Mastin:** Russell, do you have anything to add? **Webb:** I agree somewhat with Vicki, because I also think that they can be trained. I mean, U.S. judges go over there. I go over there quite a bit, and there's enough cats for them to look at. They're interested in really moving forward and doing different things. You know, I really feel bad for them and I think it's best that we should keep them, and we can train them. I don't see difficulty in training. **Mastin:** I'm going to call on Kathy Calhoun, then Darrell. Then we're going to go in to a vote. **Calhoun:** I just wanted to add, you asked a question Rich if any of the Associate Judges would quit the Program if it was announced that this is going to be sunset. It's not a matter of them quitting. They are going to be pursued by competing registries to come on board and we will – this is a really bad look for CFA and I cannot support this. We manage to train people – I'm sorry, I feel very passionate about this – we manage to train people in other circumstances. I think we owe it to our Associate Judges' Program to make every effort to make this work for them, but not – NOT – to sunset the Program. Thank you. **Newkirk:** I'm also leaning toward voting against this, but you asked a question about, is speaking English an issue. I do think that is an issue. I supported that when it was brought up, but I would sure like a reconsideration on the requirement that they speak English. Vicki said she has spoken to many of these people on the phone and it's not an issue, so if it's not an issue, why the requirement? I would also like to point out, where would be in Japan had we had that requirement that you had to speak English? We would have nothing in Japan if that had been a problem, so I think the English thing needs to go. We're a global organization and if we can't handle a few extra languages, then there's something wrong with us – not wrong with them. **Mastin:** Darrell, if you want to bring that forward later, you can make that motion and bring it forward. **Newkirk:** OK.

Mastin: We are now going to go to the vote. If you're in favor of the motion as written, raise your hand.

Mastin called the motion. **Motion Failed.** Griswold, Moser and Shelton voting yes.

Mastin: Pam Moser, Marilee, Mike. Lower your hands. If you're opposed, raise your hand. Kathy Calhoun, Rachel, Carol, Kenny, Russell, Yukiko, Pam DelaBar, Cathy Dunham, Darrell, Paula, Pauli and John. Lower your hands. Any abstentions? I see no abstentions, Rachel. Please call the vote. **Anger:** I have 3 yes, 12 no, zero abstentions. **Mastin:** That motion fails.

- *Correct the Judging Program Rules inadvertent deletion of Breed Council Membership for Breeder Applicants. Requirement was removed in error with the June 2023 Judging Program Rule revision.*

| Existing Wording | Proposed Wording |
|---|--|
| | <p>2.15 <u>First Specialty Application Package.</u></p> <p><u>p. The Breeder Applicant must be an active member in good standing of a CFA Breed Council at the time of application.</u></p> |
| <p>RATIONALE: In April 2023 the Judging Program Rule 2.29 was: The Applicant must be an active member in good standing of a CFA Breed Council at the time of application. The Breed Council Membership requirement was inadvertently removed when the Exhibitor application requirements were created October 2023. Motion is to correct this error.</p> | |

Mastin: Let's continue. **Nye:** OK, the next item of business here is breed council membership requirement for the breeder applicant into the Judging Program. This was inadvertently dropped when they rewrote the Judging Program requirements and added the exhibitor stream. We're just putting it back in there. Everybody that has applied since this was dropped already has had their breed council membership, so it wasn't an issue but we wanted to get it back in there and corrected. **DelaBar:** Since we no longer have the exhibitor applicant, can we just drop the breeder portion of what it says, to just say, *The applicant must be an active member in good standing of the CFA breed council at the time of application.* **Nye:** We still have the exhibitor stream in there. **DelaBar:** I thought we did away with it. **Nye:** No, we did away with the Accelerated Program. However, the Judging Program Committee has had a discussion about this, and since it is a large change, we aren't planning on making it this time. It will be either in June or October to remove that piece, and then I'll change the word here to just put *applicant.* **DelaBar:** Good enough, thanks.

Mastin: Any other questions? May I have somebody second this motion? **Currle:** Kenny seconds. **Mastin:** Thank you Kenny. Any objections? Seeing no objections, this motion passes unanimously.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

As of February 1, 2024 the JPC has received the following complete applications, meeting the deadline to be considered at the June 27, 2024 Board Meeting in Coralville, IA:

- *Allen Shi – China Associate Judge SH, Application for First Specialty Shorthair*
- *Eugene Jeong – South Korea Associate Judge SH, Application for First Specialty Shorthair*
- *Yukiyo Matsushita – Japan, Application for First Specialty Longhair*

Breed Awareness and Orientation School Subcommittee

Subcommittee Chair: Barbara Jaeger

Current Happenings of Committee:

The first Allbreed BAOS was held in Peer Belgium, February 7 – 11, 2024. Our instructors for this class were Peter Van Wonterghem, Barbara Jaeger, and Nancy Dodds. Attendance included 2 Approved AB Judges who transitioned from the RUI Association to CFA this past year. They were required to attend a BAOS and this class satisfied the requirement. We also had one additional Judge from RUI, who is transitioning to the CFA program and is currently Approval Pending Allbreed. In addition to those three individuals, we had one AB Judge taking the class for Continuing Education Credits, and 3 Associate Judges (one from Germany and two from Finland) attending the BAOS. The two additional individuals are exhibitors from Region 9 who are interested in learning more about the CFA Judging Program. One thing we did determine was that an Allbreed BAOS is too much material for the attendees to absorb in five days. We will be going back to the Specialty format for the October 2024 school.

| <i>FIRST NAME</i> | <i>LAST NAME</i> | <i>AB</i> | <i>LH</i> | <i>SH</i> | <i>COUNTRY</i> | <i>TYPE</i> |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <i>Tuija</i> | <i>Aaltonen</i> | <i>X</i> | | | <i>Finland</i> | <i>AB Attendee</i> |
| <i>Florent</i> | <i>Fissot</i> | <i>X</i> | | | <i>France</i> | <i>AB Attendee</i> |
| <i>Olga</i> | <i>Grebneva</i> | <i>X</i> | | | <i>Ukraine</i> | <i>AB Attendee</i> |
| <i>Ulrike</i> | <i>Knueppel</i> | | | <i>X</i> | <i>Germany</i> | <i>SH Attendee</i> |
| <i>Olga</i> | <i>Korotonozhkina</i> | <i>X</i> | | | <i>Ukraine</i> | <i>AB Attendee</i> |
| <i>Marika</i> | <i>Lahti</i> | <i>X</i> | | | <i>Finland</i> | <i>AB Attendee</i> |
| <i>Inaki</i> | <i>Mansilla</i> | <i>X</i> | | | <i>United Kingdom</i> | <i>AB Attendee</i> |
| <i>Elena</i> | <i>Podrugina</i> | <i>X</i> | | | <i>Ukraine</i> | <i>AB Attendee</i> |
| <i>Yanina</i> | <i>Vanwonderghem</i> | <i>X</i> | | | <i>Belgium</i> | <i>AB CE</i> |

The Breeds and Standards Committee in conjunction with the BAOS subcommittee completed the updates and modification of the breed presentation materials for the school. This was not completed in time for the Hong Kong or International BAOS but was completed by the Breeds and Standards Committee and hopefully, we can keep these presentations current and up to date.

Future Projections for Committee:

Working to ensure that the entire slide decks for the BAOS is current and complete. This will not happen overnight, but with the Breed and Standards Committee and the work that members of the JPC have done, things have been completed and we are hoping to keep them current.

Planning BAOS for October 2024, to be held in conjunction with the International Show in Cleveland, OH.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

1. *Update on the October BAOS in Cleveland, OH*
2. *Flyer for the October 2024 BAOS, should be completed and distributed by the end of June 2024.*
3. *Budget figures for the BAOS for Cleveland, OH, October 2024 and possible additional locations for 2025 schools.*

*Respectfully Submitted,
Barbara Jaeger, Subcommittee Chair*

Mastin: Next? **Nye:** The Breed Awareness report is here. The next one will be at the International Show and we're looking at locations in the ID for another one in the 2024-2025 season.

Guest Judging Report

Guest Judging Administrator: Wendy Heidt

CFA Judges to Judge non-CFA Assignments:

| <i>Judge</i> | <i>Assn</i> | <i>Sponsor</i> | <i>City/Country</i> | <i>Date</i> |
|------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|
| Nye, Vicki | Seminar | Alianza Felina (CFA) | Malaga, Spain | 2/2/24 |
| Cheng, Amanda | WCF | ELCATS | Hong Kong | 2/2/24 |
| Sarriff, Amir | Fun Show | ? | Banda Aceh, Indo. | 2/17/24 |
| Yang, Morning | CFA?/Fun show | Grooming & Fashion Show | Liaocheng, Shandong | 2/17/24 |
| Rattanaweerawong, I | Fun Show | Thai Independent Club | Bangkok, Thailand | 2/24/24 |
| Ruengruglikit, Chate | Seminar | Royal Canin | Bangkok, Thailand | 3/5/24 |
| Nasin, Doreann | CFF | Cute and Curly Selkirk Rex Club | Barrington, RI | 4/20/24 |
| Zottoli, Jeri | CFF | Cute and Curly Selkirk Rex Club | Barrington, RI | 4/20/24 |
| Dodds, Nancy | CCCof A/ NSW CFA | Dorrigo& District Cat Club | Armidale, Australia | 4/27/24 |
| Ganoe, Dennis | CCCofA | Dorrigo and District Cat Club | Armidale, Australia | 4/27/24 |
| Dodds, Nancy | ACF | CatsWA | Perth Australia | 5/4/24 |
| Ganoe, Dennis | ACF | Cats NW | Perth, Australia | 5/5/24 |
| DelaBar, Pam | FIFe | Satakissa | Nakkila, Finland | 5/25/24 |
| Cruvongpaiboon, Keeratiya | Fun Show | 8CL - Suroboyo Wani | Surabaya, Indonesia | 5/26/24 |
| Yuenyadchai, Atcha | Fun Show | 8CL - Suroboyo Wani | Surabaya, Indonesia | 5/26/24 |
| DelaBar, Pam | WCF | Fennica Cattus | Finland | 6/1/24 |
| Pun, Nicholas | ACF | Cats NSW INC | Clarendon NSW Australia | 6/8/24 |
| Sarriff, Amir | Fun Show | ? | Pontianak, Indonesia | 6/9/24 |
| Reding, Jennifer | NZCF | National Show | Awapuni, New Zealand | 6/16/24 |
| Gradowski, Chuck | ACF/Cats NSW | Borderline Cats Inc | THS, NSW, Australia | 8/31/24 |

CFA Club Requests to use a Guest Judge:

| <i>Judge</i> | <i>Assn</i> | <i>CFA Show</i> | <i>City/Country</i> | <i>Date</i> | <i>Date Approved or Tier 1 Guest Judge</i> |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------------|---------------------------|-------------|--|
| Ling, Christine | CCA | China Ace Cat Club | Chengdu, China | 3/2/24 | app GJ |
| Ling, Christine | CCA | China Kiwi | Shanghai, China | 3/9/24 | app GJ |
| Hamalainen, Satu | FIFe | China Brilliant CC | Liaocheng, Shandong China | 3/16/24 | app GJ |
| Balciuniene, Inga | WCF | Borneo Cat Fanciers | Jawa Barat, Indonesia | 3/30/24 | APP GJ |
| Ling, Christine | CCA | Borneo Cat Fanciers | Jawa Barat, Indonesia | 3/30/24 | app GJ |
| Ling, Christine | CCA | Sawasdee Cat Club | Bangkok, Thailand | 4/6/24 | app GJ |
| Merrill, Vicky | CFE | Seacoast Cat Club | Concord, NH | 5/5/24 | 2/21/24 app WH |

2023-2024 Season Guest Judging

| <i>Guest Judge Name</i> | <i># Shows</i> |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| <i>Balciuniene, Inga</i> | 2 |
| <i>Christison, Janis</i> | 1 |
| <i>Gleason, Elaine</i> | 1 |
| <i>Ling, Christine</i> | 5 |
| <i>Hamalainen, Satu</i> | 3 |

Nye: The Guest Judges that have been approved – the CFA judges and also Guest Judges for CFA.

Approved Guest Judges - Two Tier Program

Background and Rationale:

In 2020, the CFA Board approved a two tier status of guest judges, elevating 14 other association judges who had judged for CFA a minimum of 15 times, to Approved Guest Judge. It was determined that these judges were experienced in CFA Show Standards & Rules, and their paperwork was reviewed and error free. The guidelines put in place to become an Approved Guest Judge were listed, however nothing was documented on requirements to remain as an Approved Guest Judge, regarding CFA judging activity or their current association license. Though the Approved Guest Judge Level is defined as “judges for CFA regularly” the Judging Program Committee is requesting two additions: 1) vi. In order to maintain Approved Guest Judge Level, must judge 2 times in 3 years. This is similar to what is required of our CFA judges to continue to be licensed. Additionally, 2) vii. Maintain their judging license with an approved association. The judges that do not meet the Approved Guest Judge guidelines will still be able to guest judge for CFA, however the CFA club will need to request approval from the Guest Judge Administrator, 60 days prior to their show date and provide Guest Judge Evaluations. CFA club use of Guest Judges has diminished in the last 3 years, with more reliance on CFA Associate Judges to fulfill those judging assignments.

Guest Judging Procedures (passed at August 11, 2020 CFA BOD Meeting, effective immediately)

1. Create two levels of guest judges:

a. Approved Guest Level – judges for CFA regularly.

i. Meets or has met requirements of Guest Judge Level.

ii. Reviews the on-line breed presentations of newly accepted/advanced breeds and any breeds with significant standard changes.

iii. Must have no remedial evaluations or unanswered complaints on file.

iv. Will have paperwork reviewed at least bi-annually and expectation is that it will be free of mechanical errors and with minimal paperwork errors.

v. May judge up to ten (10) CFA shows in any region or division, without prior approval from the JPC.

vi. In order to maintain Approved Guest Judge Level, must judge 2 times in 3 years.

vii. Maintain their judging license with an approved association.

APPENDIX 1:

List of Frequent Guest Judges identified to elevate to the Approved Guest Judge Level.

| | Guest Judge | Association | # CFA Shows 2017-18 - 2020 | # CFA Shows 2011- 7/2020 |
|-----------|------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | <i>Davies, Allan</i> | <i>CCCA</i> | <i>22</i> | <i>35</i> |
| 2 | <i>du Plessis, Kaai</i> | <i>WCF</i> | <i>20</i> | <i>27</i> |
| 3 | <i>U'Ren, Cheryle</i> | <i>CCCA</i> | <i>20</i> | <i>69</i> |
| 4 | <i>Hamalainen, Satu</i> | <i>FiFe</i> | <i>18</i> | <i>36</i> |
| 5 | <i>Merritt, Chris</i> | <i>CCCA</i> | <i>15</i> | <i>32</i> |
| 6 | <i>Balciuniene, Inga</i> | <i>WCF</i> | <i>14</i> | <i>16</i> |
| 7 | <i>Slizhevskaya, Tatiana</i> | <i>RUI</i> | <i>14</i> | <i>25</i> |
| 8 | <i>Ling, Christine</i> | <i>CCA</i> | <i>13</i> | <i>13</i> |
| 9 | <i>Counasse, Daniel</i> | <i>LOOF/WCF</i> | <i>10</i> | <i>14</i> |
| 10 | <i>Nazarova, Anna</i> | <i>WCF</i> | <i>10</i> | <i>29</i> |

Nye: Here is the next motion. This is the two-tiered Guest Judging Approval Program that was passed in 2019 and it was amended in 2020 to elevate 15 judges to the Approved Guest Judging level, based on their service to CFA and how many shows that they have judged. It has come to our attention that there is no requirement for someone to stay at the Approved level once we put them there. We've made a suggestion to add two more items under *Approved Guest Judge*. It's *vi. In order to maintain Approved Guest Judge Level, must judge 2 times in 3 years.* And *vii. Maintain their judging license with an approved association.* So, we're not utilizing the Guest Judges in the same way as we were before. We have fewer shows after COVID. We also have a great reliance on the Associate Judges, and so some of these judges have not judge for us,

even before COVID. #7, Tatiana Slizhevskaya, and also #10, Anna Nazarova, from Russia. It does not mean that they cannot guest judge for us, it's just that we're not putting the Approved level on them. Cheryl U'Ren is no longer a licensed judge with CCA.

Motion: *Add vi. to Approved Guest Judge Level, "In order to maintain Approved Guest Judge, must judge 2 times in 3 years", and "vii. Maintain their judging license with an approved association".*

Nye: So, we've split this into two motions. The first motion is to add the vi and vii, that they have to judge two times in three years, because we have a reliance on their familiarity with our show rules and the standards and any changes that have been made. If they're not judging, the benefit of them being an Approved Guest Judge is that they can judge 10 times a year and that they don't require guest judging approval 60 days beforehand, nor do they get an evaluation. So, we would like them to follow under the regular Guest Judge and not an Approved Guest Judge, because if they've not judged that much we would like to have evaluations and the benefit of approving them when they come through. Also, maintain their judging license with an approved association. That's the first motion. [Transcript goes to next motion] **Mastin:** We're going to do this in two separate parts. I'm going to take the first motion. May I have a second? **Anger:** Rachel seconds. **Mastin:** Thank you Rachel. **DelaBar:** The problem I have with this is, we approve this and then we go sort of *ex post facto* into the second motion. I really don't have a real problem with it, but just how it's going to be applied afterwards, so I'm probably going to be an abstention on this one; one, because I happen to live with somebody that's on this list, but I do have some remarks on the second motion. **Mastin:** Pam, just so we're clear on this, you're abstaining with a conflict. **DelaBar:** Well yes, I would think it would be a conflict. **Mastin:** Ed, do you agree? **Raymond:** Yes, I do.

Mastin: Are there any other questions on the first motion? OK, I'm going to call for the vote. If you're in favor of the first motion, raise your hand.

Mastin called the motion. **Motion Carried.** DelaBar abstained with conflict.

Mastin: Rachel, Kenny, Carol, Mike, Pauli, Marilee, Russell, Cathy Dunham, Kathy Calhoun, John, Yukiko, Pam Moser, Darrell, Paula. Please lower your hand. If you are opposed, raise your hand. If you're an abstention, raise your hand. Pam DelaBar. Lower your hand, Pam. Rachel? **Anger:** That's 14 yes, zero no, 1 abstention with conflict. **Mastin:** OK, motion passes.

Motion: *Remove Cheryl U'Ren, Tatiana Slizhevskaya and Anna Nazarova from Approved Guest Judge Level due to no CFA guest judging in 3 or more years, or no longer holds a judging license.*

Nye: The second motion is to edit this list to conform to what that first motion we'll be passing, and remove these three from the Approved Guest Judge list. As I said, it does not mean that these people cannot guest judge for us, it's just that they're not an Approved Guest Judge. **Mastin:** OK, we're going to do this in two separate parts. [transcript goes to first motion]

Mastin: OK, now we're on to the second motion. Are there any questions or comments? **DelaBar:** Cheryl U'Ren will never leave a hospital bed, but she has been a strong supporter of CFA and guest judged for us several times. I would like to see possibly a letter written to her, to

express one, that we're sorry that she can no longer guest judge for us, instead of dismissing her because we have these new laws. I'm going to say one thing about Tatiana and Anna. Tatiana is from the Ukraine. Anna is from Russia. We have had no shows in the Ukraine, where Tatiana has judged in other parts of Europe, but basically that's where she was a Guest Judge. We hopefully will have a show in Ukraine in November, but Anna, we've only had two 4-ring shows in Russia, which means we can only have two Guest Judges. I don't want to lose these people as resources for the Guest Judging Program when, in fact, the reason that they have not judged is due to a war within Europe. **Mastin:** Vicki, did I hear you correctly that the motion is to just remove these judges from the list, yet they are still – **Nye:** Yes, they still can be Guest Judges. Actually, the second motion really isn't required because the first motion makes it to where they're not Approved Guest Judges any longer. I just put it in here to make everyone aware. Another item, Tatiana Slizhevskaya, she did most of her judging in China and CCA has removed Cheryle U'Ren from their list of judges. This is housekeeping clean-up. It's not a slap in their face, it's a benefit to them, because when they do get a guest judging assignment, they get sent an email with the links to our show rules and all the other requirements, plus they get an evaluation and coaching to the club to provide them with their best clerks so they can get through this. They can still guest judge for us, except for Cheryle U'Ren because she doesn't hold a license anymore. **DelaBar:** She's in the hospital. **Nye:** Yes, I understand she is. I've talked to Rod. **Mastin:** OK, we understand.

Currle: Vicki, would you consider just pulling this motion? **Nye:** Sure, we can pull that one, and then I can just edit this list myself, because Motion #1 is passed already. That means that Tatiana and Anna are no longer an Approved Guest Judge. **Currle:** I would like to make a motion to withdraw the second motion. **Krzanowski:** Carol seconds. **Mastin:** Before we do that, Ed, would you agree? Is the second motion even necessary? **Raymond:** It is not necessary. Since Russell has a standing motion, he should be the one to withdraw it. **Mastin:** Russell? **Webb:** OK, I'll withdraw that motion. **Mastin:** Rachel, do you agree, since you were a second? **Anger:** I was not a second. The second motion had not been seconded. My motion was just on Motion #1. **Mastin:** Oh, very good, thank you. We don't even have a second. We have a motion but we don't have a second. **Currle:** It will die.

No Action, for lack of a second.

DelaBar: I am not in favor of *ex post facto* type of actions within CFA. Let's pass something, one thing; now we can go do this. I am just actually amazed that we would, right now, remove two people who are affected by something that is way above and beyond their control. I understand about Cheryle. Yes, we all know, but it's a problem. **Mastin:** OK, let's try and get the Cheryle U'Ren situation out of the way here. Rachel, would you be so kind to write a letter to Cheryle, on behalf of the board. **Anger:** That would be my honor. **Mastin:** OK, so that one is taken care of.

Mastin: Pam DelaBar, you don't want them removed from the list, then make a motion. **DelaBar:** You've got a couple of motions on the floor right now, Rich, that need to be resolved before I can make a motion. **Mastin:** Well no, I don't have anything on the floor, because Russell withdrew the motion. We don't need Kenny's motion to withdraw. **Raymond:** The current motion just passed. Rather than making the requirement retroactive, perhaps you make it forward looking, so starting today someone has to judge two times in 3 years. That buys a little

bit more time for Tatiana and Anna. **DelaBar:** I would go with that, ed. **Anger:** I don't see an effective date on the first one, and our Judging Program Rules are considered effective as soon as they are published. So, in that context, perhaps the second one would be *ex post facto*, but I think we can just leave it as is, except for removing Cheryle. That's all I really need to say. **Mastin:** So, do we need a motion to make it effective today? **Newkirk:** I will use Pam DelaBar's saying. We are making mountains out of mouse turds. This motion that we passed doesn't remove them from the guest judging list. It moves them from the Approved Guest Judges list. They can still guest judge. It only removes them from the Approved Guest Judges list. We are sitting here arguing over this, wasting valuable time. I don't see what the problem is. **DelaBar:** The problem is, the time that it would take to get approval for them to guest judge, because now they are under the 60 day rule and if we're able to get a show going in Ukraine, it might be at 30 days. If we are able to get more shows going in Russia, it might be 30 days ahead of time and not the 60 days, which means we couldn't use them. That's one of the major reasons why to keep them on the list, at least for this period of time. **Mastin:** Darrell, does that address the concern? **Newkirk:** I have washed my hands of it.

Mastin: OK. Unless somebody is going to make a motion to make vi and vii effective today. **DelaBar:** I will so move. **Mastin:** I need a second. **Currle:** Kenny will second. **Mastin:** OK Kenny, thank you. Have we discussed it enough? **Raymond:** I just want to suggest that you make the motion to make it effective prospectively, as opposed to effective today. It can be interpreted differently. **Mastin:** OK, be specific. **Newkirk:** I would like the Secretary to state the motion that we are voting on. **Mastin:** Rachel? **Anger:** To be perfectly honest, I was answering another question on the side, so perhaps the maker of the motion can restate it. **Mastin:** Pam DelaBar, please restate the motion. **DelaBar:** I move that the motion, in order to maintain Approved Guest Judge [status], must judge two times in three years, be effective – and Ed, I'm sorry, I don't understand what you said. **Raymond:** We want it to be effective prospectively. **DelaBar:** What is "prospectively"? How are you applying that? **Raymond:** That the period of three years starts today. **DelaBar:** OK. I will move that in order to maintain Approved Guest Judge – I guess it would be – status, they must judge two times in three years, prospectively. **Currle:** Kenny agrees. **Mastin:** OK, thank you Kenny. Marilee, you had your hand up. **Griswold:** Sorry, I just wasn't really sure on the prospective part, because what's the purpose of passing the first motion if we're not going to stand by those rules? So, we're saying those rules start – it's like a reset of the timeline starting today. Is that what we're voting on? **Mastin:** Ed, is that correct? **Raymond:** That is correct. **Mastin:** OK, thank you. **Nye:** May I ask, I would like to word that, "must judge two times in three years, beginning 4/2/2024"? Nobody is going to know what "prospectively" is, and I'm going to get questions on that. Does that accomplish the same? **Mastin:** Ed, do you need "prospectively" before 4/2/2024? **Raymond:** No. The change that's being proposed is fine. **Mastin:** Pam DelaBar, do you accept? **DelaBar:** Yes. **Mastin:** Kenny, do you accept? **Currle:** Yes. **Mastin:** OK, I'm going to call for the vote. If you are in favor of this, raise your hand.

Mastin called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Moser and Newkirk voting no.

Mastin: Pam DelaBar, Paula, Marilee, Kenny, Pauli, Russell, Rachel, Mike, Cathy Dunham, Yukiko, Carol, John, Kathy Calhoun. Lower your hands. If you are opposed, raise your hand. Darrell and Pam Moser. If you are an abstention, raise your hand. No abstentions. Rachel?

Anger: That is 13 yes, 2 no, zero abstentions. **Mastin:** OK, the motion passes, not unanimously. It passes.

Mastin: Vicki, what else do you have? **Nye:** That's it for open session. **Mastin:** OK, thank you to everybody on your Committee and special thank you to those that participated in the questionnaire on the social media.

*Judging Program Reports
Respectfully Submitted
Vicki Nye, Co-Chair
CFA Judging Program*

Newkirk: May I bring up a reconsideration, having to speak English as a requirement? **Mastin:** Yes. Present your motion. **Newkirk:** That's it. **Currle:** Kenny will second. **Mastin:** OK. Just a reminder to the board. This is not a pre-noticed motion. It will require 2/3. Is there any discussion? [**Secretary's Note:** Comments made by **Calhoun** appear after the motion to reconsider] **Anger:** As a point of order, are we discussing the motion to reconsider, or are we discussing removing English as a requirement? **Newkirk:** The motion to reconsider. **Anger:** That's what I thought. So, although I agree 100% with Kathy's comments, I'm going to put those after the next motion. **Mastin:** Good point, thank you for pointing that out. No more discussion. Any objections, to reconsider? Seeing no objections, that motion passes unanimously.

The motion [to reconsider] is ratified by unanimous consent.

Mastin: OK Darrell. **Newkirk:** OK, so I will restate again and sort of back up what Kathy said. We have gotten along for a number of years with non-English speaking judging candidates. It hasn't hurt us at this point. I don't see the point in trying to make a rule that they have to learn English. It's hard enough to learn the standards, but to learn a foreign language at the same time is just above and beyond. I just don't think that this helps CFA, in my opinion. **Mastin:** OK, so your motion is, judges are not required to speak the English language, correct? **Newkirk:** Yes. **Currle:** Second. **Mastin:** I think it was Kenny, sorry.

[From previous motion] **Calhoun:** I think that I will be supporting this motion made by Darrell. I feel that we have managed to train and produce quality judges in Japan. We have used interpreters where needed. We don't have any requirement for a judge that comes in, let's say, from the United States to judge in China, to be able to speak the language to communicate with the individuals. We don't do that. I think that this, if in fact we want to truly embrace being global, if we want to truly embrace inclusion, then requiring judges that are native to a certain country to speak a foreign language flies in the face of that. Thank you.

Mastin: Any further discussion on this motion? Any objections to this motion? I see Marilee has her hand up, so I'm going to call for the vote. Please lower your hands. **Griswold:** I was trying to make a discussion. **Mastin:** OK, go ahead. Make your point. **Griswold:** I don't think that the original intent of the English speaking requirement was to make them fluent in English. I think the original intent was to make them able to communicate in what I would consider "cat English," if that makes any sense. If I'm going to train someone, I need them to know the word "round" or "round eyes" or "long coat" or something, so I don't think it was ever

the intent of the JPC to make them fluent in English and be able to read Thoreau, I think it was to have a basic ability to communicate so far as training goes and that all of our training, including the BAOS and all of our continuing education is also in English. So, to make them the best judges that they can be to meet our standards, that they should be able to speak the bare modicum of English with regards to cat descriptions. This was going to be something that I think the JPC was going to do on a case-by-case basis. **Calhoun:** So again, we managed to train very, very, very excellent judges in Japan with the use of interpreters. I see no reason why we can't continue that, and it adds to the materials in English. The burden of that resides on us, not on people trying to become part of our Program. Again, are we global or are we not? If we are, then those tools that individuals need, need to be offered in other languages. Now, it has been said that that is very hard to continue to make right. Again, the burden of addressing that and making it happen resides with us. That's it. **Curle:** Very quickly, there are plenty of translation apps out there that we can take advantage of, particularly when we're training these individuals. **Mastin:** OK, thank you. Pauli, you hand your hand up, too. Did you want to discuss something or are you objecting to the motion? **Huhtaniemi:** Actually, Marilee already said everything what I wanted to say.

Mastin: OK. Discussion has ended. I'm going to call it like I did in the beginning. Are there any objections to the motion? OK, lower your hand. I'm going to call for the vote. If you are in favor, raise your hand.

Mastin called the motion. **Motion Carried.** Griswold, Huhtaniemi and Webb voting no.

Mastin: Rachel, Darrell, Kenny, Pam DelaBar, Carol, John, Cathy Dunham, Yukiko, Paula, Pam Moser, Mike. Lower your hands. If you are opposed, raise your hand. Russell, Marilee, Pauli. If you're an abstention, raise your hand. No abstentions. Rachel, please call the vote. **Anger:** I didn't get a vote from Kathy. I think she raised her hand after the no votes were called. **Mastin:** Is that Kathy Calhoun or Cathy Dunham? **Anger:** Sorry, Kathy Calhoun. **Mastin:** Kathy Calhoun, were you a yes vote? **Calhoun:** I support the motion, yes. **Mastin:** Thank you. **Anger:** That's 12 yes, 3 no, zero abstentions. **Mastin:** OK, the motion passes. Darrell, thank you for bringing that up.

[**Secretary's Note:** Show Rule 2.1 was adopted at the October 16/17, 2023 board meeting and is included below for reference.]

Now Rescinded

4. Add language to Judging Program Rules to require applicants to the Judging Program be able to understand and speak English.

| Existing Wording | Proposed Wording |
|---|--|
| <p>2.1 The Applicant must be at least eighteen (18) years of age.</p> | <p>2.1 The Applicant must be at least eighteen (18) years of age; <u>understand and be able to speak English.</u></p> |
| <p>RATIONALE: Some, if not all, color class training will be from English-speaking judges, the required BAOS is only taught in English, all continuing education training is done in English including the bi-</p> | |

annual test. This is a current requirement in the Associate Judge Application Guidelines.

Calhoun: I would like to make a motion that we reconsider the prior motion to not allow judge trainees in China to train in mainland China. **Mastin:** Can you repeat that motion? **Calhoun:** I would like to have, I guess it's the Judging Program rule. **Mastin:** Go ahead. What are we reconsidering? Be specific again. **Calhoun:** Reconsider – reconsider – that we not allow trainees in China to train in mainland China. **Mastin:** Darrell, are you seconding that motion? **Newkirk:** I will second it so we can have discussion on it. **Mastin:** OK, are there any – we're reconsidering. If there's discussion, it's got to be quick. Any discussion? **Newkirk:** I want to know, has the NGO issue been resolved? That was why this, I think, was brought up because when we tried to have trainees in China, there was all kinds of objections that the NGO wasn't notified, it wasn't approved, blah, blah, blah, and we all know what the bottom line was. It was one team objecting to the other team's trainees. So, I am not going to support this unless I have a clear understanding that the NGO process has been resolve. **Calhoun:** It is my understanding that the issue with a specific trainee was based on their employment. Whether or not it would put the NGOs in jeopardy. That being said, I have a problem with punishing everyone for the potential wrongdoing of a group. I think that we should address the perpetrators but not punish every single person who had absolutely nothing to do with this in China that we just said we encourage to go into the regular Program, but you cannot do it at home. **Mastin:** Kathy, just a simple yes or no. Specific to Darrell's question, is the NGO issue not an issue for doing training in China? **Calhoun:** The NGO issue was based on an individual's employment. I don't think it would be wise to go into that exactly, but I think most of the people on the board know and that was the basis for that individual not being [inaudible]. Now, do we have sanctions and groups in China? Of course we do. Can we address that? Of course we can't, but I'm going to say, that should be done on a case-by-case basis and it should be brought to the ID Committee to do it, so when someone rejects an individual, we should address that, but again, to paint everybody with the same brush is inappropriate, especially when we're saying we're trying to encourage people to go into the regular Program. **Griswold:** Of course, I don't have primary knowledge of this, but secondary knowledge from judges that have been judging over there who say the NGO, we're still having some significant issues over there. We've discussed some interesting ideas on how that might be resolved, so I don't think the direct answer to Darrell's question is an affirmative. I think it's still probably a negative. **Wong:** Two things. First of all, I think the NGO issue in general is resolved. It's just a matter of, do we need to find a bit more information about the trainee, the occupation, who that person is with the NGO because the trainee is still deemed to be a working member in the show, but I think that it's largely resolved. Second thing, I know the other reason why some clubs do not welcome trainees, because the exhibitors got very confused when their cats are being judged twice, especially when they got a ribbon from the trainee and that's being taken away and not count, they get rather upset. I personally think that's something that's happening in every, single jurisdiction where we have trainees, and we should make China the exception. The audience should be educated, rather than just say, "OK, because the audience couldn't understand the whole training process, so we stop all the training in China completely." So, I think we should allow trainees to train in China. Thank you.

Newkirk: As Marilee said, I don't think the NGO issue is completely resolved and I won't support overturning the lack of training of people in China. I would like for them to, but I can tell you right now, if you think that both sides are going to allow training, you're sadly

mistaken. It is not going to happen. This is all a power play on the part of one person over there, and if I thought that you guys could sit down and talk some sense into this person, then I would change my mind, but I just don't think it's going to happen. **DelaBar:** I guess I'm a little confused, because in a week and a half, I have a trainee in China. **Mastin:** OK, so Vicki or Russell, can you address Pam's comment? **Nye:** Yes. The requirement was for first specialty applicants, and the trainee that Pam has is someone who is already a judge going to be judging for that show and training on the second day. I also wanted to mention that that judge that they were talking about, it was a big problem with them being a trainee. They are judging in China now, and they still have the same status. It had nothing to do with her employment, because she is more than able to judge for them over in China. Part of the problem is that they don't license their shows until a week or two before they are going to happen. It's impossible for us to even find out who the show manager is, get approval for a trainee to work over there and get a trainee set up there, based on the fact that we don't have a time window to do it in. **Mastin:** Kathy Calhoun, I saw you hand your hand up and you took it down. Did you have any further comments at this time? **Calhoun:** I do, I do. So, we have had trainees in China. Actually, this individual trained in China earlier in the season and the issue around employment surfaced. If you read what's on the employer's website, it would be a concern. As to what Marilee said, I'm not sure if the second party or whatever hearsay is all about problems with trainees. We have problems that we have had in China. We just recently had a problem, but that problem had nothing to do with a trainee. That was a completely different issue, so I just don't think that we should mix up what we're talking about. We are talking about penalizing an entire group of people that we just said in the JA [*sic*, Judging Program Committee] discussion that we wanted to encourage. So, saying that you cannot train in your home country is certainly not encouraging.

Mastin: OK, thank you. Before I go any further and call on Darrell, I just want to remind the board, if we're going to go down a path of discussing issues in China, I prefer we do it in closed session. Let's stick to the reconsideration of what's being discussed here and we either get to reconsider or we don't get to reconsider. **Newkirk:** I think we've exhausted debate. How about we just vote on the reconsideration. **Mastin:** I agree. All those in favor to reconsider, raise your hand.

Mastin called the motion. **Motion Failed.** Calhoun, Colilla, DelaBar, Dunham, Hayata and Noble voting yes.

Mastin: Kathy Calhoun, Pam DelaBar, John Colilla, Cathy Dunham, Yukiko, Paula. Lower your hand. If you are opposed raise your hand. Darrell, Marilee, Kenny, Russell, Carol, Pam Moser, Pauli, Mike, Rachel. Lower your hand. If you are an abstention raise your hand. No abstentions. Rachel, call the vote. **Anger:** I think I am missing Kenny's vote. **Mastin:** Kenny, what was your vote? **Currle:** No. **Anger:** That's 6 yes, 9 no, zero abstentions. **Mastin:** OK, motion fails.

[**Secretary's Note:** This motion was adopted at the December 5, 2023 teleconference and is included here for reference]

Motion Stands

Motion: *China Applicants must complete their Judging Program training outside of China.*

Motion Carried [vote sealed].

Mastin: Vicki, Russell and any other board members, do we have anything else for the Judging Program? **Webb:** No. **Mastin:** OK, very good. Thank you, Vicki and Russell and all your Committee members.

(5) **CENTRAL OFFICE OPERATIONS.**

Submitted by: Allene Tartaglia, Executive Director

Mastin: We're going to move on to the next agenda item, and that is Central Office, right? Allene? **Tartaglia:** Hopefully, this will be short.

Cattery Reports: *With the release of eCat 2.0, cattery reports can be provided "live" from an eCat account, provided the owner of the eCat account is also an owner/co-owner of the cattery. We propose this enhancement to eCat be provided complimentary to the cattery owner.*

Cattery reports generate little to no revenue for CFA and are a resource for cattery owners to monitor activity of their cattery name and help determine if there has been any suspicious/fraudulent activity. Cattery reports were provided at no charge to 2023 Breed Council members for this reason.

Supplying the cattery reports to breed council members was manual and labor intense. Programming to automate this task for breed council members would incur programming costs. Cattery reports being available on demand through eCat completely eliminates the need for staff time and/or programming costs.

Annette Wilson, Breeds and Standards chair, supports this change.

Tartaglia: We are asking that we no longer charge for cattery reports, because they may be provided live on an eCat account with the new release, of course only to the owner or co-owner of that cattery. They generate very little income. There was \$350 within the past 12 months. They are a wonderful resource for cattery owners to monitor activity on their cattery name, especially for any suspicious or fraudulent activity. So, my motion – and also, Annette Wilson is in support of this change, because it would now mean that breed council members don't receive this as a part of their membership – a free cattery report – it will be available to everyone.

Action Item: *Provide cattery reports at no charge to a cattery owner from their eCat account, effective with the release of eCat 2.0, and cease sending cattery reports to breed council members, effective with 2024 memberships.*

Tartaglia: So, my action item would be [reads]. **Anger:** Rachel seconds. **Mastin:** Who made the motion? **Tartaglia:** I can't make it. **Anger:** Oh sorry. Then Rachel so moves. **Newkirk:** I'll second. **Mastin:** Alright, thank you. Any discussion? **Calhoun:** I have a question as to how this is going to be managed. Will this be based by request, or is this automatically going to happen at some given point in time if this is approved? **Tartaglia:** People will be able to add catteries to their eCat account if they are an owner of the cattery, and we will be manually monitoring requests to add catteries to an eCat account. Then, once the cattery has been added to their eCat account, then there will be a button or something that they can click on to get a cattery report. **Mastin:** Kathy, are you finished? **Calhoun:** No. **Mastin:** Go ahead. **Calhoun:** So, does this increase the ability for someone – I know you said you will be manually monitoring who is being added to what, but that concerns me, and will this potentially actually increase the ability

for fraud? **Tartaglia:** Well, when I say we're manually monitoring, if somebody wants to add a cattery to use on their eCat account, they have to be the owner of that cattery. They can't add the cattery themselves. We will be adding it. They request it and then we will approve that request if they are one of the owners on the cattery account. I don't see where it's going to increase the opportunity for fraud. We already are providing free cattery reports to breed council members, so it's really no different than what we're already doing. We're thinking that it will help reduce fraud, because cattery owners will now have an opportunity to easily review whatever activity is on their cattery. **Mastin:** James, any comments? **Simbro:** No. Allene pretty much said it all. The eCat 2.0, we're locking down a lot of things. One of them is adding a cattery to your eCat account. We're verifying information that will be mainly reviewed by staff, so not anybody can just add a cattery to an eCat account and run a report. Again, we see this as helping stop any issues with people getting information on a cattery and then nobody knowing about it until two years later when they happen to purchase a cattery report or find it through some other way. **Mastin:** Kathy, are you finished? **Calhoun:** Yes. **Mastin:** OK. Any objections to this motion? Seeing no objections, this motion passes unanimously.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Tartaglia: Thank you. **Mastin:** Does anybody have any questions for Allene, other than what she brought up? OK, thank you Allene. There were no questions.

(6) **CLUB MEMBERSHIP.**

Committee Chair: Carol Krzanowski
List of Committee Members: Pauli Huhtaniemi

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

New club applications have been received and are being prepared for presentation to the Board at the June 2024 meeting. Assistance and guidance were provided to clubs with questions and issues regarding membership and applications.

Club Resignations

Three clubs indicated to Central Office that they are resigning from CFA membership: Alianza Felina, Region 9, Attachment A; Birmingham Feline Fanciers, Region 7, Attachment B; and Greater St. Louis Cat Club, Region 6, Attachment C.

Action Item: *Accept with regret the resignation of Alianza Felina, effective March 11, 2024.*

Mastin: OK, we're going to move on to Club Membership, Carol. **Krzanowski:** My report is very brief. It's strictly to handle a few club resignations that we received early on this year. Normally, I would present them in my regular report in June, but since they came in so early I did not want to wait that long to put these resignations on record in the minutes. I'm going to read my action items. They are up there on the board. I'm going to make a standing motion to accept them. **Mastin:** Does somebody want to make a standing second? **Currle:** Kenny will. **Mastin:** I think I heard Kenny again, so Kenny has got the drop tonight, guys. **Currle:** Yes, I'm quick. **Mastin:** He is quick. **Calhoun:** But we don't acknowledge hands up, so you know, hey. **Mastin:** OK. Taking the first action item, discussion? Objections? Seeing no objections, the first one passes unanimously.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Included in the resignation letter from Alianza Felina was a request that the club name be retired and not reissued to another club in the future.

Action Item: *The club name Alianza Felina shall not be reissued or reused by any other CFA club.*

Mastin: Going on to the second one. Discussion? Objections? **DelaBar:** I'm just generally against not allowing the re-use of club names, like we have in the past. This is not something new, and I don't see why it would be necessary in this situation. **Mastin:** Pam, are you going to object to this when I ask for objections? **DelaBar:** Yes. **Mastin:** OK. Any other discussion? All those in favor, please raise your hand.

Mastin called the motion. **Motion Carried.** DelaBar and Newkirk voting no.

Mastin: Kenny, Cathy Dunham, John, Pam Moser, Carol, Paula, Mike, Russell, Yukiko, Kathy Calhoun, Pauli, Marilee. Please lower your hand. If you are opposed, please raise your hand. Darrell and Pam DelaBar. Please lower your hand. If you are an abstention, raise your hand. No abstentions. Rachel? **Anger:** I was a yes vote, so that is 13 yes, 2 no, zero abstentions. **Mastin:** OK, motion passes.

Action Item: Accept with regret the resignation of Birmingham Feline Fanciers, effective January 23, 2024.

Mastin: Moving on to the third one. Any discussion? Any objections? Seeing no objections, the motion passes unanimously.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Action Item: Accept with regret the resignation of Greater St. Louis Cat Club, effective January 23, 2024.

Mastin: The fourth one, discussion? Objections? Seeing no objections, that one passes unanimously.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Future Projections for Committee:

Process and submit new club applications for consideration by the Board.

Time Frame:

April 2024 to June 2024 CFA Board meeting.

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

All new clubs that have applied for membership and satisfactorily completed their documentation.

*Respectfully submitted,
Carol Krzanowski, Chair*

Mastin: Carol, do you have anything else you want to review? **Krzanowski:** No, that is all I have. Thank you very much. **Mastin:** Does anybody have any questions for Carol? Seeing no questions, thank you Carol.

(7) **SHOW RULES.**

Committee Chair: *Ed Raymond*
Liaison to Board: *Carol Krzanowski*
List of Committee Members: *Cathy Dunham, Kathy Gumm, Shirley Michaud-Dent, Brad Newcomb*

Mastin: We’re going to move into Show Rules, which is you [Krzanowski] and Ed Raymond. Who is taking this? **Raymond:** I guess I am. **Krzanowski:** Before Ed starts, I would like to also make a standing motion on these board action items. **Mastin:** OK very good. Thank you, Carol. May I have a standing second? **Webb:** Russell seconds. **Mastin:** OK Russell, thank you.

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

The Committee has prepared the show rule changes set forth below based on requests from Board members and others.

Board Action Items:

Mastin: OK Ed. **Raymond:** Only two action items tonight. Hopefully it will be brief.

1. *Define the Allbreed and Specialty ribbons to be hung in Super Specialty finals.*

NOTE: While these changes will be made to the permanent show rules, they will be included, along with an appropriate note, in the Addendum to the print version of the 2024-2025 Show Rules because the print version has already been sent to press. These changes will be incorporated into the digital version of the 2024-2025 Show Rules which can be accessed on CFA.org.

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Article XI – During the Show – Judging and Awards, amend 11.28 and 11.29 | CFA Central Office | |
| Existing Wording | Proposed Wording | |
| 11.28 Standard Allbreed Rings ... OCP Rings ... | 11.28 Standard Allbreed Rings ... OCP Rings ... <u>Super Specialty Rings</u> <u>In the Allbreed portion of a Super Specialty ring.</u> | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p><u>the Championship finals awards will be Best through 10th Best Cat and Best, 2nd Best and 3rd Allbreed Best Champion when cat entries are less than 85. For Championship entries of 85 or more, the final awards will be Best through 15th Best Cat and Best through Fifth Best Allbreed Champion.</u></p> <p><u>In the Allbreed portion of a Super Specialty ring, Kitten finals awards will be Best through 10th Best Kitten when kitten entries are less than 75; for kitten entries of 75 or more the final awards will be Best through 15th Best Kitten.</u></p> <p><u>In the Allbreed portion of a Super Specialty ring, Premiership finals awards will be Best through 10th Best Cat and Best and 2nd Best Allbreed Premier when cat entries are less than 50. For Premiership entries of 50 or more, Best through 15th Best Cat, Best, 2nd, and 3rd Best Allbreed will be awarded.</u></p> |
| <p>11.29 a. In Longhair/Shorthair Specialty rings the Championship finals will be Best through 10th Best Cat, Best, 2nd Best and 3rd Best Champion when cat entries are less than 85.</p> <p>For Championship entries of 85 or more, the final awards will be Best through 15th Best Cat; Best through Fifth Best Champion.</p> <p>Kitten finals awards will be Best through 10th Best Kitten when kitten entries are less than 75, for kitten entries of 75 or more the final awards will be Best through 15th Best Kitten.</p> <p>Premiership finals awards will be Best through 10th Best Cat, Best and 2nd Best Premier when cat entries are less than 50. For Premiership entries of 50 or more, the final awards will be Best through 15th Best Cat; Best, 2nd Best and 3rd Best Premier.</p> <p>Veteran Class finals awards will be Best through 5th Best Cat or Best through 10th Best Cat as determined by show management.</p> <p>b....</p> | <p>11.29 a. In Longhair/Shorthair Specialty rings, <u>including the Longhair/Shorthair Specialty portions of a Super Specialty ring,</u> the Championship finals will be Best through 10th Best Cat, Best, 2nd Best and 3rd Best Champion when cat entries <u>in the particular specialty (longhair or shorthair)</u> are less than 85. For Championship entries of 85 or more <u>in the particular specialty (longhair or shorthair),</u> the final awards will be Best through 15th Best Cat; Best through Fifth Best Champion.</p> <p><u>In Longhair/Shorthair Specialty rings, including the Longhair/Shorthair Specialty portions of a Super Specialty ring,</u> Kitten finals awards will be Best through 10th Best Kitten when kitten entries <u>in the particular specialty (longhair or shorthair)</u> are less than 75; for kitten entries of 75 or more <u>in the particular specialty (longhair or shorthair)</u> the final awards will be Best through 15th Best Kitten.</p> <p><u>In Longhair/Shorthair Specialty rings, including the Longhair/Shorthair Specialty portions of a Super Specialty ring,</u> Premiership finals awards will be Best through 10th Best Cat, Best and 2nd Best Premier when cat entries <u>in the particular specialty (longhair or shorthair)</u> are less than 50. For Premiership entries of 50 or more <u>in the particular specialty (longhair or</u></p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p><u>shorthair</u>), the final awards will be Best through 15th Best Cat; Best, 2nd Best and 3rd Best Premier.</p> <p>Veteran Class finals awards will be Best through 5th Best Cat or Best through 10th Best Cat as determined by show management.</p> <p>b....</p> |
| <p>RATIONALE: While shows featuring Super Specialty rings do not usually receive sufficient entries in a class to trigger the awarding of Top 15 placements and additional Champion and Premier placements, it does happen on occasion. These changes are intended to clarify that, when such a situation arises, the determination of the placements to be awarded is made independently for the LH, SH, and Allbreed finals in that ring.</p> | |

Raymond: We discovered that, while the Show Rules were clear about what ribbons to be hung for standard allbreed rings and OCP rings, there was no mention of what was being hung for super specialty rings, particularly when the question of top 15 came up and how that was determined. We drafted rules here to lay out how the ribbons are to be hung and making clear that the determination of placements to be awarded is made independently for the longhair and shorthair and allbreed finals in that ring. **Mastin:** Very good. Any questions or comments?

Griswold: So, this came up. It has actually come up a few times for me where I'm doing a super specialty ring, which would be top 10 longhair, top 10 shorthair and top 10 allbreed, but the count becomes high enough to reach the top 15 mark, which for the allbreed rings automatically triggers top 5 longhair champions, top 5 shorthair champions and then top 5 allbreed champions, for a total of 10 champions. So, what this actually do is, say that when you have a super specialty, that no longer does the allbreed count count for the 5/5 for the champions. It removes that, so the allbreed top 85, top 15 now the way this is written just awards top 5 allbreed champions. **Raymond:** That is correct. **Griswold:** Unless the specialty portion of those reached 85, which never happens for the longhair and the shorthair separately. That would be an incredible, super amazing count, to have 85 for longhairs and 85 for shorthairs, but essentially we are saying that when you are doing a super specialty ring and your championship counts hit the top 15 mark, that we're actually reducing the number of champions that are going to be awarded, which doesn't really make sense to me when a regular allbreed ring would be awarding 5 and 5. I just wanted to make sure everybody knows exactly what we're talking about, but that doesn't make any real sense to me at all. **Raymond:** I can just tell you, the thought was that in the super specialty ring, you essentially have a longhair ring, a shorthair ring, and then a combined allbreed final, so we were looking at the longhair count to determine the longhair ribbons being awarded for the champions, and the shorthair ribbons the same. When you get to allbreed, if the count was 85 or above, you would do your top 5 allbreed champions. **Mastin:** So Ed, does the wording as it stands right now, is it in line with what Marilee is stating? No? OK. **Raymond:** I think it is. We've got the allbreed portion in Rule 11.28 and the specialty portion in 11.29. **DelaBar:** This has happened twice in my region – the first time in Italy in January and – both times in Italy, January and February. I have no problems with 11.28 but when you get to 11.29, one, who is responsible for making the count of the number of champions? When it was first written for a top 15, which I think is the priority on this, even over the super specialty, it was

very easy – 5 allbreed, 5 longhair, 5 shorthair. Whatever the count ends up to be, sometimes they will get more points with one specialty with a champion win over the other specialty but at least we had a definitive number. I think that 11.29 clouds the issue even more, and puts it more on the judge to try to figure out what they're supposed to be hanging, when the original stated it as 5/5/5. I would hate to see somebody miscount by a couple of champions and then the judge gets in trouble, the people don't get the points, and it's a big mess. Marilee and I have discussed this, and we both thought when it's spelled out with the top 15 being the priority over the super specialty as far as number of champions, that made it much easier on the judge. This I think makes it much harder on the judge. **Tartaglia:** I was a little confused by what Marilee said. If there's a top 15 in the allbreed portion, there are 5 champions given out. I thought you said it was only 3, but there are 5. So, all that we're saying is, just clarifying that if the longhair count does not meet the 85, then it's just best, 2nd and 3rd. So, if you have top 10, it's best, 2nd and 3rd. If you have top 15, if you have enough count, then it's best through 5th. There is confusion among judges. Some judges did it one way, other judges did it another way, so I don't know. I'm not sure how it's harder on a judge. I'm not a judge, so I can't speak to that, but there is confusion and not all judges agree that it should be done a different way than what we've outlined here. **Griswold:** So, Pam, what I wanted to point out to you is that for a regular allbreed ring, now they've put in something new but for a regular allbreed ring, once you hit 85 you get 5 longhairs, 5 shorthairs and 5 allbreeds, so that's a total of 10 champions that you can final. What they have put in here now is that if you're doing a super specialty ring and you hit 85, the only top 5 you get is for the allbreed portion. For the longhair and shorthair portions, you only get 3. So essentially we're doing away with 4 champions that would be in our allbreed with 85, with the 10 champions, if that makes sense. They are saying that the only way to get top 5 for the longhair/shorthair is if you have a huge amount of entries in each specialty. Then you can do top 5 longhair and top 5 shorthair, but because we have the allbreed ring as top 85, then we can do top 5 allbreed champions, but still can't do 5 and 5 for the longhair/shorthair anymore. We can only do 3 and 3. So, this actually backs up the number of champions you can award once you hit the top 15 for having over 85. **Krzanowski:** I don't agree with that at all, because the way this rule is written, in an allbreed ring, of course if it reaches 85 it would be top 5 allbreed champions, top 5 longhair champions, top 5 shorthair champions. In a super specialty ring, there are actually 3 finals, so the allbreed final would still do top 5 allbreed, top 5 longhair, top 5 shorthair champions. It's only in the specialty portion that it would be top 3 if the count was less than 85. The longhair/shorthair portion of a super specialty is generally just an opportunity for exhibitors to have another specialty ring, so the count should be applied the same way in a longhair/shorthair specialty as it is in those portions of a super specialty. I don't think those portions of a super specialty should benefit from the 85+ count. That's my opinion. **Dunham:** I agree with what Carol said. If you just look at a super specialty for the three finals that they are, they are individual components of a ring. You look at your count for the shorthairs, the count for your longhairs, you hang accordingly. If it's 85 in allbreed, then hang it accordingly for an allbreed ring. So, I don't see what the big problem is here. If you look at it and break it down for what it really is, it's three components of a ring that make up a super specialty ring – three finals, each have their own counts, and the counts are pretty easy. You look at a breed summary and go, "yep, I got 85 in shorthairs, I get to hang top 5; nope, I don't have it in longhairs, I hang top 3; I have it overall in allbreed, so I hang a top 5." The counts are not that difficult to figure out. **Raymond:** I was just going to say, what we tried to do is harmonize this so that, for a judge, if you're hanging top 10, you're hanging 3; if you're hanging top 15, you're hanging 5 champions.

So, if you've got a situation where you've got sufficient longhairs to hang a top 15, then you're going to hang top 5 longhair champions. Same with allbreed. Your shorthairs, if you don't have the numbers, you are going to be hanging top 10 for the final and top 3. **Newkirk:** I understand what Marilee is saying, and I think this is going to cause mechanical errors left and right if you do this, because when you do top 15 and you do 5 longs and shorts, those are basically specialty champion wins except for the top 5 allbreed. Why in the world would you hang 5 shorthairs and 5 longhairs in an allbreed ring, and then only hang 3 in the specialty part of it? Those three have to be your 3 longhairs and your 3 shorthairs, so why are you even hanging them to begin with? Those specialty points for champions or premiers are going to be in the specialty part of your allbreed final. I don't understand why you're even hanging 1, 2 and 3 longhair, 1, 2 and 3 shorthair in the specialty part of it. That's covered in the allbreed portion of it. **Raymond:** Perhaps I'm misinformed. It was my understanding that when it came to super specialty rings, judges did each of their specialty finals separately, and then did a separate allbreed final, bringing back some portion of the cats from the longhair and shorthair. **Newkirk:** That's correct, but the problem is that when you do that allbreed final, you're doing your 5 longhair champions and your 5 shorthair champions. That's not allbreed. Those are specialty portions of it. You hang top 5 allbreed, that's the allbreed portion of it. I mean, when I've done super specialty, I hang my longs and my shorts and my allbreed champions, and then I do the top 10 longhair, top 10 shorthair and then the top 15. You're just hanging the same ribbons for 1, 2 and 3. If you're not hanging 1, 2 and 3 as part of your 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 in the allbreed, then you are mechanically corrupt.

Tartaglia: So, what we're saying is, a super specialty ring is completely different from an allbreed ring. Sure, in a regular allbreed ring, you have top 15. You're going to do your top 5 allbreed, your top 5 longhair, top 5 shorthair. This isn't an allbreed ring, it's an allbreed portion of a super specialty ring. So, if you have top 15 allbreed, then you're just going to hang your 5 allbreed champions. You're going to leave your longhair and shorthair champions for the longhair and shorthair finals. So, if you only have enough to do top 10 longhair, then you do 3 champions. If you happen to have had enough to do top 15 longhair, then you would do your 5 longhair champions. So, it's different from a regular allbreed ring. **Newkirk:** It is not different. It's no different. **DelaBar:** No, no. **Tartaglia:** Then we just need to spell it out in the show rules however you want it, so everybody does the same thing. That's all we're really looking for, because judges are doing it differently. The top 15 was new this year and people didn't know how to handle it, so we're just asking however you want to handle it, let's get it in the show rules. **DelaBar:** When we do a super specialty ring, we are building mechanically our allbreed ring. The reason for super specialty is to give exhibitors at least the feeling of a possible final when we do this, and sometimes it's a saving grace because of the quality that we are given. So, a normal super specialty ring, we're going to be doing a top 10 longhair, top 10 shorthair, with normally 3 champions for longhair, 3 champions for shorthair. Then when we get to the allbreed portion, we will be taking a mix of who we think the top 10 are from the two finals and putting those in, in the allbreed final. They have to be in the priority which we hung in the specialty finals. Then, we marry up the allbreed champions. When we hit top 15, it's basically the same mechanics. We have our top 10 longhair, top 10 shorthair, then we get to where we marry it up with our top 15 allbreed. The difference is that we have 5 allbreed champions from which we have to also have 5 longhair champions, 5 shorthair champions. If we are only hanging 3 longhair, 3 shorthair champions, then when we get to that allbreed portion, then we have to come up with 2 more champions on both specialties for longhair and shorthair. It's much easier when you're building your mechanics in this situation to go ahead and identify those top 5 longhair

champions, those top 5 shorthair champions, so when you're putting it on your final sheet, you've already got that, that you can carry over to your allbreed finals and the allbreed champions. So, it's a question of mechanics and what's easier for the judges in this situation that takes a lot more time and we're trying to do it the most efficiently as possible, when we're adding, "oh, I've got to come up with 2 more longhair champions and 2 more shorthair champions to make the top 15." I'm sorry guys, this takes more time and it doesn't make sense.

Griswold: I just wanted to point out, like Carol had mentioned that once it hit top 85, that it would be a top 85 allbreed ring with 5 shorthair, 5 longhair and 5 allbreed, but that is not how this is written. This says that once it hits 85 of a super specialty ring, only the allbreed portion will award top 5 champions for allbreed. It does not say 5 longhair, 5 shorthair. It further delineates the longhair and shorthair if those have entries more than 85, then those specific specialty portions can have top 5, but the way this is written at this moment, it says that once you get best through 15th best cat, all we can award in a super specialty allbreed ring is best through 5th best allbreed champion.

Newkirk: I think I've said all I want to say. If you're going to require the judges, when they do the specialty portion of their super specialty ring, to hang 3 longs and 3 shorts in each one of those specialty rings, it's like Pam says, it just creates more work. Just name the 5 longhair and the 5 shorthair, and then when you do the allbreed portion, you can do your top 15 plus your 5 allbreed champions, but you can't select 5 longhair, 5 shorthair, 5 allbreed in the allbreed portion and then pick different champions in the specialty. They have to be mechanically correct. It just makes more sense to name your 5 longhairs when you're doing your longhair champion final, and your 5 shorthairs when you do your shorthair champion final. They have to be mechanically the same cats. You can't pick an Aby, an American and a Burmilla, and then in your allbreed pick 5 different shorthair or longhair champions. They have to be mechanically correct, and to name 3 in the longhair and the shorthair specialty portion just confuses the water. Just name the 5 longhairs, the 5 shorthairs, and then do the 5 allbreeds when you do the allbreed portion of it.

Shelton: My concern here is, there appears to be – first, I think there's a conflict here between the existing rules, but my main point is, there seems to be a fair amount of confusion on how this could be done and how we want it to be done, and the proposed change doesn't seem to address those. If there's that much confusion now and we're going to introduce a change which may introduce different confusion, I know we're running up against the beginning of the season but I don't know if we should be voting on this.

Raymond: We can write the rule however you want us to write the rule. I guess, one thing I would say is that the way the rule is written, when you get to the allbreed portion of a super specialty ring, the only thing you're hanging with regard to champions are your top 5. I understand they need to be mechanically correct from the specialty portions. In the specialties, assuming that there were not 85 longhairs or 85 shorthairs, when you hang best through 3rd, you now have 6 champions to consider for your top 5 in the allbreed. There is no intent that you would then rehang 5 longhair champions and 5 shorthair champions. You have already done your longhair and shorthair champions as part of your specialty portion of your ring. Now you're just doing your allbreed portion. That's what we had in mind. If that's incorrect and we should do it differently, let me know and I'll rewrite it.

DelaBar: We still have to put on our finals sheet to fill in not only the allbreed champions, but the longhair and shorthair, as well.

Tartaglia: No.

DelaBar: Yes, we do.

Tartaglia: Why? It's a super specialty ring.

Mastin: Hang on. I'm going to ask everybody, one person talks at a time. Don't talk unless you're called on please. Pam, please continue.

DelaBar: I have three finals sheets to deal with when I do a super specialty. I have a longhair final sheet and I have to fill that

out with my longhair champions. Same thing for shorthair. At the top, it's marked either longhair or it's marked shorthair for the championship portion. The others are left blank. When we get to the allbreed, we have to fill out the allbreed champions, the longhair champions and shorthair. We just bring that over from our other sheets. It helps the mechanics, especially, as I'm trying to say, when we are dealing with a super specialty with a top 15, because we have 85 or more cats in allbreed championship, we're dealing with quite a bit more mechanics and quite a bit more possibilities to mess things up. We're trying to get something through that makes it as easy as possible for the judge to be mechanically correct, award the cats that they want to award, and hopefully make our constituents happy with what they receive. As far as not putting these things forward, bring from the longhair sheet over to the allbreed sheet, that just is bookkeeping. That's mechanics. **Mastin:** OK, thank you Pam.

Krzanowski: Allene, could you just scroll backwards a little bit? I just want to see a little bit more of the allbreed section. I'm seeing now where Marilee was saying, in the super specialty allbreed portion it just says, *Best through 5th best allbreed champion* and it should include *Best through 5th best longhair champion* and *Best through 5th best shorthair champion*, so that is correct. I would like to see this tabled and maybe brought back later on. Reword it a bit and we'll try again. **Mastin:** You're the maker of the motion. You could table this if that's what you want to do. **Krzanowski:** I think, based on the discussion, it's probably wise to do so. I don't think we're going to come to any conclusion tonight and I think we would like to try and reword it, tweak it a little bit and see if we can find something that satisfies everyone's opinion. **Mastin:** Russell, do you agree with Carol? You made the second. **Webb:** Yes, I agree. **DelaBar:** Which one are you going to table? I think 11.28 helps define what we're actually doing. Where the confusion comes is with 11.29. **Mastin:** Carol, you can answer that directly. **Krzanowski:** I think we should table both of them for the time being. **Raymond:** Just help me understand what you want, please. I believe I'm hearing that in a super specialty ring, the number of longhair and shorthair champions will be determined by the allbreed count. **Mastin:** I see Kenny and Pam DelaBar are shaking their head yes. **Raymond:** Pam is shaking her head yes. **Mastin:** And Kenny. **Newkirk:** And Darrell. **Raymond:** Does that same logic with regard to the allbreed count rules also govern whether you're hanging top 10 or top 15 in longhairs and shorthairs? So, if there's more than 85 cats in allbreed, what are you hanging in your longhair final and your shorthair final? Is it a top 10 or is it a top 15? **Mastin:** Marilee, you've got your hand up. Answer the question. **Griswold:** So, in my opinion, the top 15 rule supersedes the super specialty. Once you hit top 15, then you go to 5 longhair, 5 shorthair and 5 allbreed champions. To be honest, there's a lot of times I'm doing these finals in two parts. I'm doing the bottom part of my longhair and my shorthair final, and the top part of my longhair and shorthair final, along with my allbreed, and I'm hanging two ribbons at the same time. So, I'm doing all of this in one big stroke. I'm not doing like a longhair final and a shorthair final, so I guess for me the question is, which rule supersedes the other? For me, once you hit top 15 for allbreed finals, that automatically triggers top 5 longhair, top 5 shorthair, top 5 allbreed. **Raymond:** But what does it do to your top 10? That is my question? **Griswold:** Not a thing. Nothing. Those top 10 remain the same. **Raymond:** So, in your longhair final, the longhair portion of your super specialty, you're going to hang top 10. Same with shorthair, but when you get to allbreed where there are more than 85 cats entered, you will do a top 15. **Griswold:** Correct. **Raymond:** OK. I just need to know what you want, so I can write the rule accordingly. **Griswold:** For the champion portions, once it hits top 15 for the allbreed, then we automatically go to the top 15 rules for the allbreed, which would be 5 longhair, 5 shorthair, 5 allbreed. So, I may not even final any

champions in my shorthair specialty finals at all, and just do one final with 10 champions, because for me that’s how I read these rules, was that if we have a super specialty ring, we have 10 shorthair, 10 longhair. Once it hits top 15, we have 10 champions and then top 15 allbreed.

Mastin: Carol and Russell have agreed to table this and I see Pam DelaBar has her hand up, Pam Moser has her hand up. Marilee, you are very vocal on this. So is Pam DelaBar and Darrell.

Carol and Ed, would you please work with either Marilee, Pam DelaBar and Darrell to come back with a revised show rule on this? **Raymond:** Sure. **Mastin:** Carol? **Krzanowski:** Yes.

Mastin: OK, so then, end of discussion on this one, because this one took over a half an hour.

Pam, I will give you 10 seconds to make a comment and then we have got to move on. **DelaBar:** Put a judge on the Show Rules Committee. **Mastin:** That’s a request. OK, we heard your request. I’ll leave it up to Carol and Ed.

Tabled.

2. *Delete the Addendum to the 2024-2025 Show Rules which extends the waiver of Show Rule 4.03 for the 2024-2025 show season.*

| Addendum | Show Rules Committee |
|---|--|
| Existing Wording | Proposed Wording |
| The waiver of Show Rule 4.03 is extended whereby cancelled shows during the 2024-2025 show season do not count against a club’s traditional date. | The waiver of Show Rule 4.03 is extended whereby cancelled shows during the 2024-2025 show season do not count against a club’s traditional date <u>in Region 9.</u> |
| <p>RATIONALE: During the course of the 2020-2021 show season, the Board passed an exception to SR 2.34 which provided in part: “Clubs that do not hold a show for two (2) consecutive years starting on or after May 1, 2023, on their traditional date will lose the distinction of having a traditional date weekend. The failure of a club to hold a show before May 1, 2023, will have no effect on that club's traditional date.” That exception was extended for the 2021-2022 show season.</p> <p>Beginning with the 2022-2023 show season and continuing through the 2023-2024 show season, the Board passed show rules addenda which “Extended the waiver of Show Rule 4.03 whereby cancelled shows during the [2022-2023] show season do not count against a club's traditional date.” [Reference to a different show rule where Traditional Dates are mentioned but having the same impact.] At its December 2023 meeting the Board passed a similar addendum to be effective for the 2024-2025 show season.</p> <p>At the present time, available show dates are in short supply. The addenda which have been in place since the 2020-2021 show season have effectively frozen the traditional date calendar and that freeze will continue to be in effect until two years have passed following the expiration of the last addendum. Currently, the last addendum will expire at the end of the 2024-2025 show season, meaning that a club that does not hold a show will be able to retain its traditional date until the end of the 2026-2027 show season.</p> <p>Recognizing that the pandemic is over, this proposal would end the exception/waiver and require clubs to hold a show on their traditional date by the end of the 2025-2026 show season in order to retain their traditional date. By moving up the end of the freeze by one year, clubs without traditional dates which wish to put on shows may have access to available dates sooner.</p> | |

Mastin: Let's go on to the next one. Carol? Or Ed, I'm sorry. Ed, you are doing these.

Raymond: The next one is a request to delete the addendum that was previously asked for the 2024-2025 Show Rules which extended the waiver of Show Rule 4.03 for next season. I'll give you some history. This is the waiver that says if a club doesn't hold a show, it doesn't count against their traditional date. As the history shows, this harkens back to the pandemic in the 2020-2021 show season. The board actually at that point, or the Show Rules Committee or somebody, the language actually indicated that missed shows in the past didn't count and it was only shows missing two years of shows after a certain date that would count against their traditional date. That keeps getting rolled over, so we're at the point now where if the existing addendum goes forward for next year, it won't be until after the 2026-2027 show season, assuming that there's no additional addendum in the following show year, before traditional dates start to free up. By removing this waiver from the addendum, it would give the clubs next season and the following season to hold a show on the traditional date, or their traditional date would become available to other clubs who might be looking for a date.

Mastin: Pam Moser is Chair of Show Scheduling. Do you have any comments on this recommendation?

Moser: I don't particularly care for it. We're trying to get these clubs show dates, and then we just continually have to keep rolling it over, even though they're not putting on shows, so it becomes cumbersome for us to try to find show dates for these clubs when a club hasn't put on a show since 2019. I mean, I do have issues that this is too long, but if we passed that we are going to continue to go forward, which I don't understand why we did, because the pandemic was over. We started putting on shows I think in 2022, almost every club was putting on shows. Like I said, I'm not a fan of this.

Mastin: Let me just clarify. You're in favor of removing the extension though, correct?

Moser: Yes.

Mastin: OK, OK.

DelaBar: I want to hold the possibility of still having the traditional dates, especially for Region 9. We have conditions above and beyond the pandemic and I believe that the clubs in Ukraine and Russia deserve to have consideration, so I want to retain the right to hold their traditional dates.

Mastin: Any comments? Ed, Carol, any comments to Pam's request to allow Region 9 to retain the traditional dates?

Krzanowski: I don't really have any objection to that, no.

Raymond: We would just have to rewrite the proposal such that it applied only to Region 9.

DelaBar: Region 9 doesn't come under the Show Scheduling Committee anyway. Neither does Region 8. It's only for Regions 1-7.

Mastin: Ed is referring to the addendum –

DelaBar: Yes, I know.

Mastin: – which covers all shows.

Raymond: The “no shows in two years” rule applies to all regions, according to the show rules. So, if you wanted to have an exception to that for Region 9, you would need to, rather than deleting this waiver, probably just add the words *in Region 9* to the end of the existing one.

DelaBar: How about I do what I want to do, and you can go ahead and have your – obviously, your show problems are within Regions 1-7 because we're not having a real problem with scheduling over here. So, if we can go ahead and not be put on the chopping block because we held shows' traditional dates due to unbelievable circumstances, then I don't have a problem with it.

Mastin: OK Ed, how do we want to proceed so there's a separate addendum for Region 9?

Raymond: I would suggest that we amend this proposal and, rather than strike the existing language, we retain the existing language and add the words *in Region 9* to the end of the sentence.

Mastin: Carol, are you amending the motion?

Krzanowski: I don't know if we should say *in Region 9 only*. Maybe that's not necessary though.

Mastin: Ed, *except Region 9*?

Raymond: No, I think *in Region 9*.

Mastin: *in Region 9*, so it's just in Region 9.

Raymond: We're going to leave the existing language the way it is, and just add the words *in Region 9* to the end of that sentence.

Mastin: To the end. Carol, I think that addresses your

concern, correct? **Kranowski:** That's fine. That sounds fine to me. **Mastin:** Russell, do you agree? **Webb:** I agree. **Mastin:** Ok. Any further discussion? **Colilla:** I have a problem extending it to 2026-2027. The reason right now, there's 8 weekends that nobody can have any shows, and there's no shows going on for at least 2-3 years for those clubs. I don't think that it's fair to extend any longer than that. **Mastin:** OK, so you're in favor of this proposal. **Colilla:** No, I am not in favor. **Mastin:** Ed, do you want to clarify to John what this proposal is doing? **Raymond:** Even with the amended proposal, since it will be only applicable to Region 9, if clubs do not hold a show on their traditional date in the coming show season (2024-2025) or the following season (2025-2026), they have to hold a show in one of those two years in order to meet the show rule. Otherwise, the date frees up beginning with the 2026-2027 show season. So, they've basically got two years within which – **Colilla:** Oh, two more years. **Raymond:** Yes. **Colilla:** So, 2024-2025 and 2025-2026 they have to not put on any shows, right? **Raymond:** In order to lose their date, yes. **Colilla:** I have a real problem with that, when they already didn't put on any shows two seasons prior to 2024-2025. **Raymond:** I'm just telling you what the Show Rules currently say and the fact that in prior years the board has basically said, failure to hold a show in prior years is forgiven, it's only forward looking, and then the board started extending the exception, season by season. We have not yet begun to hit the period within which a club needs to start holding a show. If this change is made, that will start with next season. **Colilla:** I have a real problem with that, sorry. **Mastin:** John, I understand your concern. That's why Ed and Carol are bringing this forward, so it doesn't go out for another three years, it only continues for the next two years. That is an issue because clubs are holding onto traditional dates and they hold on too long to decide whether or not they're going to have a show, then it's too late for another club to find a location and license a show without having to pay fees. We can't really change what happened in the past, we can only change what's set going forward. The proposal here is to end it one year sooner so it doesn't go to 2026-2027. **Newkirk:** That brings up the point that I wanted to talk about; that is, why aren't clubs that hold a traditional date not required to make a declarative statement of whether they are having a show or not? I would say 90 days would be plenty of time for them to say, "OK, we're not having our show; someone else can have that date." They should be forced to make a decision 90 days before hand whether they are going to have a show or not. Then, we wouldn't have run into this issue that we ran into recently about a club not being able to put together a show within the 30 days. They have a traditional date, but they don't own it if they don't put a show on. **Mastin:** Darrell, your point is valid and I agree with it. The only thing, I would take it a step further and require clubs to make a decision sooner than 90 days – at least 120 or 150 days so the club that's willing to put on a show doesn't have to pay a penalty fee for licensing a show less than 90 days. It allows them some negotiations with hotels and also show halls if they have more time and not doing it at the last minute, so that could be a motion that comes forward after we address this. I'm open to that recommendation, so thank you for bringing that up. **Krzanowski:** I just want to remind everybody, and Ed has this in his rationale. There is a permanent show rule already in existence that states, *Clubs that do not hold a show for two (2) consecutive years starting on or after May 1, 2023, on their traditional date will lose the distinction of having a traditional date weekend.* Based on that text, I don't think we can just say we're going to cut it off now. I think we have to give them two years from that point to say that they are going to do a show. That being said, I really love the idea of somehow enforcing that clubs should have to indicate whether or not they are going to be using their traditional date, because there are a lot of clubs that would love to put on a show on a date, but they can't because a different club holds that traditional date. By the time that club holding

the date relinquishes it, it's too late to put plans in place. So, I would love to see something like that where we require clubs to indicate well in advance they're not going to use the date. **Colilla:** I would recommend 180 days, because it takes time to find a show hall. In 90 days, you're just not going to have enough time. 180 days would be perfect. I can put on a show in about 5 months. **Mastin:** I'm going to call on Ed and then Darrell. I'm just going to remind the group, let's take care of this motion first, then if Darrell or somebody is going to bring forward another motion, we'll address it. **Raymond:** I was just going to point out that, while I agree with what Darrell has proposed and John has suggested, these really are two separate issues. The first deals with freeing up traditional dates so that they can become another club's traditional date. The second is making use of a traditional date that is not being used in the current show year, but that date is not yet available to a club to become its traditional date. So, it has appeal to some clubs; it may not have appeal to others who are looking to settle into a date, so two separate motions. **Newkirk:** I agree with what Ed just said. Here's the issue. We've got a whole bunch of rationale here backing up taking this show rule away, so none of the rationale appears in the show rule. Unless we stick to this and then base it on this rationale – if we're not going to stick with it, then some of this stuff that's in here probably ought to be a part of a show rule. Just my opinion. **Raymond:** I think the show rule is fairly clear as it stands. The explanation of the why I'm not sure needs to be in there, but we can take another look at it. I think the instant problem is just thawing the freeze out so it becomes two years instead of three, to free up some traditional dates. **Krzanowski:** I just want to say, I don't think we can cut things off immediately. I think we have to give them that two year period to work with. Some clubs have become a little bit complacent and not wanting to produce shows because they think their dates are protected. If they realize that yes, I have two years now, I have to do something or I lose that date, they are likely to try and do a show. So, I think you have to give them a little bit of time to put things together. **Mastin:** Is there any further discussion, keeping in mind the words *in Region 9* have been added? Is there any objection? Seeing no objection, this passes unanimously.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Mastin: Darrell, do you want to make a motion on a commitment? **Newkirk:** I do, but I need a little help here. For one thing, I think someone who held a show last year wanting to put a show on this year should have like 90 days. If they fail to put a show on last year and this would be the second year that they don't have a show and potentially lose their traditional show date, then I think maybe we ought to give them a little bit of a grace period of 120 days, but at either 90 days or 120 days, or we can make it all 120 days for convenience, but they have to have an affirmative statement that they are planning to host a show. Maybe we make them pay the show license fee and they have to forfeit that, should they fail to follow through. So, I need a little help on the wording. Maybe Ed, you can help me out there, or Carol. **Raymond:** Can we bring this back later? **Mastin:** Yes, we'll bring it back later. Rachel, let's bring it back under Old Business. **Anger:** I have made a note of it. **Mastin:** OK great.

[From end of Executive Session] **Mastin:** All we have left now is Darrell's motion. Darrell, you're going to have to refresh my memory what it was. **Newkirk:** Ed, did you send that to Allene? **Raymond:** I did. Allene, can you put that motion up on the screen? **Tartaglia:** You sent me something? **Raymond:** I did. I emailed it to you. **Tartaglia:** Oh, here it is. Yes, I'm sorry. **Anger:** It's late. **Newkirk:** We're all at the giddy stage. **Tartaglia:** Can you see it?

Raymond: We can see it. **Anger:** Can you forward that motion to me, Allene? **Raymond:** Rachel, I think I sent it to you.

| Article IV – Licensing the Show, amend 4.03 e | | CFA Board | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Existing Wording | | Proposed Wording | |
| <p>4.03 e. Clubs that hold traditional dates and do not plan to hold a show for one year should let the Show Scheduling Committee know as soon as possible. The date will be considered “vacant” for the one year only and will become available to the region or other club(s) for a one-time only show date.</p> <p>With the permission of the Show Scheduling Committee, another club may hold a one-time only show on the vacant weekend.</p> | | <p>4.03 e. Clubs that hold traditional dates and do not plan to hold a show for one year should <u>must</u> let the Show Scheduling Committee know <u>at least 150 days prior to the traditional date.</u> as soon as possible. The date will be considered “vacant” for the one year only and will become available to the region or other club(s) for a one-time only show date. <u>A club which fails to provide the required notice will be required to pay a \$200 penalty.</u></p> <p>With the permission of the Show Scheduling Committee, another club may hold a one-time only show on the vacant weekend.</p> | |

Mastin: Ed and Darrell, if this motion passes and they don’t notify at least 150 days, is the date now available to the Show Scheduling Committee to allow other clubs to take the date?

Raymond: That is the one thing I did not account for. **Mastin:** I think that was the original intent, was to get the clubs to commit to a date by a date, to allow other clubs to put on a show that weekend. **Colilla:** Is the Scheduling Committee going to publish that date that’s available, so all the other neighboring regions can get a crack at it? **Mastin:** Maybe the second part that’s underlined, Ed, where it says, *A club which fails to provide the required notice, instead it will be required to pay a \$200 penalty is a club which fails to provide the required notice forfeits the date for that year and the date then becomes available to other clubs and published.* **Raymond:** I would leave the penalty, and just add the words *and will forfeit the date for that year.* **Mastin:** OK. So, you just add that at the very end? **Raymond:** Yes. **Newkirk:** That works. **Mastin:** OK, great. **Shelton:** Two concerns. One, I would like an exception for Hawaii because they function under essentially an entirely different system. They already have exceptions for absence of late payment penalties on show licensing, and there’s really nobody else over there who can take over their dates anyway. I’m concerned about doing anything like this in our current state where we have the potential to assess the club a penalty and we haven’t really had time to think about unintended consequences. **DelaBar:** Mike just said what I was going to – except for Hawaii. **Mastin:** Ed, do you want to comment? **Raymond:** You know, we’ve lived without this kind of a rule for quite a while. We’re kind of shoving things in at the last minute. Perhaps this waits for another year before it goes into the Show Rules. **Mastin:** Darrell, this was your proposal. **Newkirk:** I’m OK with that. I agree. When we rush things like this late in the night, we do – we overlook unintended consequences, so while I think the intent was good, maybe it is just better to wait until next year. **Mastin:** Are you willing to withdraw the motion? **Newkirk:** Sure, I’ll withdraw it. **Mastin:** Kenny, do you agree? **Currle:** I agree, and I want to thank everybody for

allowing me to do a lot of seconds tonight. I appreciate it. **Mastin:** You were on your game tonight Kenny, thank you.

Future Projections for Committee:

Currently, no show rule changes are anticipated to be brought forth at the June Board Meeting.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Ed Raymond, Chair*

Mastin: Ed and Carol, do you have anything else? **Raymond:** Not for me. **Krzanowski:** Not for me either. **Mastin:** Does anybody have any other questions or requests to Carol and Ed? OK, thanks Carol and Ed. [**Mathis** joins the call]

(8) **INTERNATIONAL DIVISION.**

Committee Co-Chairs: Kathy Calhoun/Matthew Wong
Subcommittee Chair/Co-Chair China: John Colilla/Wain Harding
Subcommittee Chair Asia (outside of China): Robert Zenda
Subcommittee Chair Africa, W Asia, Middle East: Jan Rogers
Subcommittee Chair Central & South America: Brad Newcomb

Jan Rogers – Subcommittee Chair Africa, W Asia, Middle East

Request to reduce the required points for a DW Award for Premiership and Kittens in Kuwait

Motion: *The point requirement for kittens for a DW Award in Kuwait be reduced to fifty points and the point requirement for premiership be reduced to 40 points for the 2024 – 2025 show season.*

Rationale: *This would be experimental for the new show season and only for the February show 2025 for Kuwait. Currently the ONLY show in the AWS region.*

Original Kuwait shows 12 years ago had significant entries. The February show this year had 7 (seven) kittens. Even if only one kitten had gone best across the board it would have accrued only sixty points - so no award... no recognition. In premiership there were fourteen entered and one absent. Only thirteen competed for the 100 pt minimum, and obviously only a few would cross the threshold of one hundred points. The awards for the cats should be about the cats.... and many of the ones shown were certainly deserving of a DW.

These cats and kittens are not going to be traveling the world to get national points, but recognition at the local level would mean a great deal, especially in this culture.

Our objective is to increase entries and observe the quality and competitiveness of the area.

Current quarantine issues also confound the equation. The government may change the rules on less than a moment's notice as evidenced this year in which the only airport in Kuwait allowed only one cat per person - which caused one exhibitor to only bring cats when he was planning to bring four! Driving for him was not an option.

Mastin: We're going to move on to International Division, Kathy Calhoun. **Calhoun:** So, hopefully you have had an opportunity to read the report. There is the first motion that was part of Jan Rogers' subcommittee [reads]. This is regarding DW awards. **Mastin:** Kathy, is that your motion? **Calhoun:** Do you want me to read the rationale? That is the motion. **Mastin:** That is your motion. Rachel, are you seconding this motion? **Anger:** If we can get a clarification on the motion. The motion, if it stands by itself, doesn't say anything about where it is, what's happening. If we can add specifically the point requirements for kittens – where to be reduced? **Calhoun:** We can add Kuwait, so the point requirement for kittens for a DW award in Kuwait. Is that what you're looking for, Rachel? **Anger:** Yes, thank you. So, I second that motion. **Mastin:** OK, thank you. Is everybody clear on where this is going to apply – Kuwait? **Currle:** [inaudible] and Africa, there's a big chance you might be able to get a Cairo club up and going again. I think

it should include that specific area. Kathy, if you wouldn't mind, why don't we add the Middle East in general, not just Kuwait. I do agree and I support Kuwait, but this was a possibility that there may be some other clubs coming up, because I know the Saudi Arabian club has been inquiring with some of our judges about having a possible show, but I just don't want to restrict it to Kuwait. **Newkirk:** Are we appending this at the very end after 2024-2025 show season and whatever area we're going to attribute this to? **Mastin:** Kathy, correct me if I'm wrong. You want this to apply to the 2024-2025 season, correct? **Calhoun:** Right, correct. **Mastin:** This is setting the point requirement in Kuwait right now for the 2024-2025 season. **Newkirk:** I'm seeking the specific location in the motion that you're going to insert that. **Calhoun:** So, it would read, *The point requirement for kittens for a DW Award in Kuwait* - now, I would also like to consider what Kenny just said, so what we might want to do with this is table it for now, rewrite it and put in also the areas that Kenny mentioned and bring it back, because I don't have a problem with that. **Mastin:** I'm OK if you table it, but you've got to bring it back soon because we should get this done before the new show season starts. **Calhoun:** We very well might be able to do that, or if we have to have an emergency meeting. We're going to have to have an addendum irregardless, and we'll probably have a meeting in May, highly likely. **Mastin:** We are definitely going to have an emergency meeting on May 7th. **Calhoun:** Rather than to – because we'll probably want to do just a little bit of work, so rather than to do it to just get it in tonight, I don't think that the Area would have a plethora of shows between the first couple of weeks in May, so I would like to do it right than to do it fast. **Mastin:** OK. Rachel, are you OK tabling this? Bringing it back? **Anger:** Yes. **Mastin:** OK great. We are going to table this one to the May 7th emergency meeting. Kenny, did you have any additional comments? **Currle:** No.

Tabled.

Motion: *Allow an exception to Show Rule 8.05 – Ring sponsorship, etc. for Kuwait for the 2024 – 2025 show season.*

Rationale: *Prior to this rule coming into existence, Kuwait generated an enormous amount of money from Breeder Sponsorships. This rule stopped this activity to the detriment of the funding of the club expenses.*

The breeders loved to see their cattery name and photos of cats in the show hall for the spectators (who do not buy or have access to the catalog) to view and for exhibitors to show off their cats and catteries. The exhibitors have since pulled a lot of their funding for the show. The exception would allow them to re-engage their previous advertising and enhance the bottom line of the club. We would stipulate no signage on rosettes (unless a memorial tribute), no signs in rings advertising the catteries in the judging rings with photos of their cats competing or otherwise. Outside the judging rings , they would be able to do this with the only stipulation that no photos of currently competing cats in the show be featured. In the same light no CFA judge currently even speaks Arabic, so writings and catteries in or near the rings would have no influence on anyone or any cat.

Mastin: Kathy, the next one? **Calhoun:** This motion is to [reads]. It is part of the culture, more or less, in Kuwait that they get an extreme amount of money from breeder sponsorships. This rule has stopped that activity and is really a burden on the club. I don't know if – I was just going to look to see if Jan is in. **Mastin:** Allene, do you see Jan? **Tartaglia:** No, I don't see her.

Kenny: I fully support what Kathy is trying to put forward here. Having been involved with Kuwait's early existence, they support each other. That club numbers close to 60-75 people. It's very exclusive. We don't speak Arabic. They do individually sponsor rings. I can see that that would be a problem here in the United States, but for one show a year these people could really use the money. The average air fare over there exceeds most trips to China. They put people in 5 star hotels and treat them like royalty. I would fully support allowing them to sub-sponsor as much as they possibly can. Again, I don't know Arabic and I've been over there 12 times.

Mastin: Kathy, my question is, are you going to include the exceptions in the motion, because the motion is to *Allow an exception to Show Rule 8.05 – Ring sponsorship, etc. for Kuwait ...* It doesn't give any specifics on it; only in the rationale it does. **Calhoun:** I believe the show rule prevents it, so it's asking for an exception to the show rule, but we can certainly restate it.

Mastin: Because I think in your rationale you said, *The exception would allow them to re-engage their previous advertising and enhance the bottom line of the club. We would stipulate no signage on rosettes, no signs in rings advertising etc.* **Huhtaniemi:** Do we want to give the exception only for Kuwait? Should the other Asian countries be included? I know this used to be the tradition there and they were pretty upset when the board limited their sponsoring options.

Mastin: Kathy, do you want to add other countries to this? **Calhoun:** I think if we're going to go and make that level of change, while on the surface I certainly don't oppose it, but again if you want to do that, we should bring it back in May, but the initial suggestion is probably a good one. Let's make sure that we don't trip over ourselves on this.

Mastin: When is the show in Kuwait? Is it in August? **Currle:** Generally, in February. **Mastin:** February, OK. So, we've got –

Calhoun: Well yeah, but if we expand it to other areas, we just need to get it done in May.

Mastin: OK, we'll do it in May. We will table it until May. Who was the second on that?

Rachel, do you know? **Anger:** I do not have that anyone seconded it. **Mastin:** OK, Kathy is tabling it until May.

Motion: An additional \$15,000 for AWS for the purpose of re-energizing several of the clubs to put on shows.

Rationale: Would be used to supplement judge's airfare (no guest judges) specifically for Turkey and for Egypt, with review for other countries.

We have lost the clubs in Egypt. The one in Turkey has gone to other registries. Time to spend some money in partnership with the money we ask them to spend on CFA.

Mastin: OK Kathy, continue. **Calhoun:** The next one is a requires for [reads]. The rationale [reads]. In regard to this, supporting Jan that she wanted to have this. I hoped that she would be able to be brought in as a participant. I think that this should be a decision of the Budget Committee and I think we should defer that to that conversation that we have in May.

Mastin: So, you're not really making the motion, then. **Calhoun:** I'm making the motion with the option to vote no. I think that this is an all-inclusive conversation that needs to be had with the board in regard to the overall bottom line. **Mastin:** Kathy, I agree with you 100% and I'm glad you pointed that out, so is there anybody who is going to second the motion, as written? If nobody is going to second it – Pam DelaBar, your hand is up. Are you seconding the motion?

DelaBar: No. **Mastin:** Pam Moser, your hand is up. Are you going to second the motion?

Moser: I'm confused. What's the motion, the motion that's up here now or is the motion to take it to the Budget Committee? **Mastin:** The motion is what's up there now and Kathy has the right

to vote no. I'm asking for a second. **Calhoun:** In my opinion, I think that this is a Budget Committee decision. **Mastin:** Correct. **Calhoun:** Well, it is an entire board decision, but it has to be factored into the total budget. **Mastin:** So Kathy, there is no second, so we're not going to proceed with the motion. **Calhoun:** OK.

For lack of a second, **No Action.**

DelaBar: I just wanted to give a point of information. Egypt does have a club, Pharaonic Cat Fanciers, and I know the secretary was in the audience earlier. Just for information, Turkey when they came on wanted to be part of Region 9, not part of AWS, and that was one of the problems when we were trying to get things going there. That's just for information, but yes we do have a club in Egypt. **Mastin:** OK, thank you for that information.

Bob Zenda – Subcommittee Chair – Asia Other

Request: *For Singapore in the coming show season, we would like to ask for a revision in the following Divisional Winner (SI) points, and elimination of qualifying rings.*

- 1) *Half the points for Kitten (50 instead of 100)*
- 2) *Half the points for Championship (100 instead of 200)*

FYI: Given the recent anti breeder laws many have begun sterilising their entire cats. Although we had unprecedented championship count in the last show in Apr 2023 (42) it is not something we expect to experience again, also given the preference of some breeders to show in a different organisation which has multiple tiered titles. Last season the highest scoring cat in this category was on 140 points.

- 3) *Premiership : Remains at 100. We were 0.25 points off this value last season.*
- 4) *HHP: Remains at 50. We were on 35.75 last season, more than 5 rings in a season should be able to tackle this.*

Overall rationale:

Exhibitor feedback lists the lack of titles (and strict registration rules) in CFA as one of the factors for not showing in our shows. Registration rules remain, however we believe we can encourage them to show by reducing the limits for Kitten and Championship DWs and helping to drive enough rings to make these titles achievable. Since we are not able to earn points toward a Singapore DW from showing outside the country, the conditions within the country have to be considered in establishing point minimums.

Factors for consideration, summarized:

1. *Reduction in number of breeders and entire cats, due to new government rules forcing a breeder of any size to commercialize; directly impacting a potential drop in championship and kitten entries.*

2. 3 registries putting on shows in Singapore, all competing for sponsors within a market of relatively small size.

3. Given our small land area and to avoid clashing dates with shows by other registries, we have to ensure our shows are well spaced out. along with points #1 and #2, this is not conducive to obtaining 100 kitten points within 4 months.

Regards,
International Division Committee

Mastin: Kathy, continue. **Calhoun:** I think Bob Zenda had asked to be promoted. **Tartaglia:** He is in. **Mastin:** I see Bob. Rachel, can you confirm we now have the correct motions for this? **Calhoun:** Appears to be. **Anger:** That is the most recent motion. I just wanted to remind everyone that this was not pre-noticed within the 24 hours. **Mastin:** Bob, are you with us? **Zenda:** Thank you. The issue is, Singapore is asking that in the coming show season, 2024-2025, they would like to ask for a revision in the division winner points and the elimination of qualifying rings. They are asking for half the points for kittens – 50 instead of 100 – half the points for championship – 100 instead of 200. As an example, given the recent anti-breeder laws, many have begun sterilizing their entire catteries. Although we had an unprecedented championship count in the last show of April 2023 – they had a whole number of 42 – it's not something they expect to experience again, given the preference of some of the breeders to show in different organizations with multiple tiered titles. Last season, the highest scoring cat in this category in Singapore was 140 points. In premiership, it should remain at 100. We were just .25 off from that value last season. Household Pets should remain at 50. They were at 35.75 last season, so we're not asking for anything there. The rationale is – **Mastin:** Bob, I'm going to stop you because we don't need to go through the rationale. We're on a very tight schedule tonight. **Zenda:** OK. **Mastin:** The board can read the rationale and ask questions, OK? **Zenda:** I'll get to the bottom line. As requested, the qualifications for DW in Singapore during the 2024-2025 season be reduced as follows: kittens 50 versus 100; championship 100 versus 200; and eliminate any number of qualifying rings. **Currle:** So moved. **Mastin:** OK, Kenny made the motion. Who is the second? **Calhoun:** Kathy seconds. **Mastin:** Thank you Kathy. Any further discussion? Any objections? Seeing no objections, the motion passes unanimously.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Zenda: Thank you. **Mastin:** Great job, Bob. Thank you very much. Kathy, continue. **Calhoun:** The rest is in closed session. **Mastin:** OK. Does anybody have any questions for Kathy? OK Kathy, thank you to you and your Committee.

(9) **VIRTUAL CAT COMPETITION.**

Committee Chair: Nancy Kerr

Liaison to Board: Marilee Griswold

List of Committee Members: Michael Altschul, Nancy Kerr, Jaime Lerner (as of 04/02/24)

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

We have been looking at alternative platforms to host the contest.

Current Happenings of Committee:

A first draft of the feedback form for the judges' use has been developed. For the platform, there appears to be two options: WordPress (WP) Voting Contest Plugin and Submittable (Social Impact Platform). A representative from Submittable gave us a ballpark range of \$8-\$10k annually. WP Voting Contest Plugin has a lite version that we can try for free. However, there is an additional cost for addons such as Pay to Vote, Paid Entry Fee and Judging Addon. The price for the voting contest plug and the three addons for one website would be around \$437.00. The cost for the level that the company recommends is around \$841 (included multiple websites). The plugins would require us to have somewhere to host the website. WordPress hosting is around \$3.00 to \$11.00 per month, depending on the options, etc.

Mastin: We're going to move on to Virtual Cat Competition. **Tartaglia:** Nancy Kerr is here. **Mastin:** OK, let's bring Nancy in. Hi Nancy. Can you hear me OK? **Kerr:** I can hear you. Can you hear me? **Mastin:** Yes, we can hear you. Thank you for joining us. **Kerr:** I'm going to kind of give you the Coles Notes version at this point, because I'm sure people are probably ready for dinner, etc., etc. So, what we have done so far with the Committee is, we've looked at two different products. One of them basically gave us an estimate of \$8,000-\$10,000. I'm like, yeah, that's even more than what the platform was. However, the option that we're looking at is the WP Voting Contest Plugin, which works with Word Press. The nice thing is, the lite version, we're supposed to be able to do a trial with free of charge. We just have to get a hosting site for Word Press, so that way we can sort of do an actual proof of concept without using a lot of money up front. We would like to do that. I have submitted a copy of the proposed judges' feedback form. What we're looking at doing is having the judges sort of evaluate 40-50 cats, so I just want to make sure with the form that it's not going to be too intensive, or something like that, because they are required to give written feedback. **Mastin:** Does anybody have any feedback on the judges' report? **DelaBar:** It's sort of a combination of what has been used in traditional rings. For those of you that don't know traditional rings, it's when the exhibitor presents a cat to a judge and they get a written evaluation of the cat. This is sort of a compilation of what we're seeing on the traditional formats. **Mastin:** Anybody else have any additional comments? Nancy, I have a question for you. The free trial, is it a one-time free trial, or a period of time free trial? **Kerr:** I can get in touch with the company, because I actually had a sales person respond back to me, so I can ask them, "how long is this for?" Actually, it's nice to get it up and running and say, "OK, here you go." I know some trials are for 30 days, some are for 60 days. This one here said basically we could do most things if we pay for voting, so I can get in

touch with the company and then submit an update. **Mastin:** OK, that will be helpful. It would be good if you can give us – at least get it off to Kathy Calhoun as soon as possible for a budget purpose, what it is you may need for the free trial run and how many months you want to do the subscription for. It appears you are looking at maybe \$1,000 or slightly thereover to get through the first free trial period. **Kerr:** Yeah, because I think they have the lite version, which is supposed to be your actual trial. It's just enough to get you hooked, and then that's when you get to pay to play at different levels. They even have a developer package, like a power user where they include four plug-in's, so it just depends on what we actually need and then they actually have it where they have the preferred package. They say that it's so-many for multiple websites and you get so-much support and then you pay so-much for the next 6 months. Then they have, you pay another amount and you get free support and free updates. You don't have to do it every 6 months.

Future Projections for Committee:

We would like to do a trial\proof of concept using the lite version of WP Voting Contest Plugin. It is the most cost-effective option with a relatively low cost to trial the software. There is also an option to hire the company set-up the contest.

Mastin: My last question, then I'm going to turn it over to Kathy Calhoun. Under *Future Projections for Committee*, you said there is also an option to hire the company to set up the contest. When you are communicating with the company, can you find out what that fee is, as well? **Kerr:** Yes, I can. **Mastin:** Great, thank you. **Calhoun:** While this isn't a lot of money, there was no budget request submitted during the normal time frame, so while we haven't finalized the budget, this really needs to be done now. Can I ask Nancy a question? **Mastin:** Go ahead, Kathy. **Calhoun:** Alright. We are in the process of doing the final run of the 2024-2025 budget, so we would probably need to get this at the very latest a week from now, what your budget request would be. Now, if this doesn't pan out, you're not committed to spend the money, that's for sure, but we absolutely have to build this in the budget. Just for shucks and grins, the budgets were due in early January. **Kerr:** OK. Yes, I think I kind of missed that, sorry. What I can do is, I'll bug the sales person tomorrow and try to nail down specifics as to exactly what is what. **Calhoun:** If there's any infrastructure that we need to – it says somewhere about plug in's are required to have somewhere host this, so we really need to really understand all that, in short order. **Mastin:** Nancy, my apologies. I do have one more question. Was there a fee for the participants? So, is there going to be any income driven from this to offset any cost? If there is, you want to include that in your budget. **Kerr:** OK. I know in the past we have charged people like \$10 per entry. **Mastin:** Right, so that may change the outcome of your budget if you have income that is greater than your expense. **Kerry:** OK yeah, because I can pull up the old budget projections and look at what I've got here with these costs and everything. **Mastin:** OK great, thank you.

Board Action Items:

Need feedback from the Board on the proposed judges' feedback form.

Time Frame:

Ongoing

What Will be Presented at the Next Meeting:

Report on software trial\proof of concept.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Nancy Kerr, Chair*

Mastin: Does anybody else have any questions or comments for Nancy? Nancy, do you have anything for the board – anything else? **Kerr:** Not at the moment. I've got some homework. **Mastin:** OK. Well, thank you very much for joining us and taking us through this. Have a good night. **Kerr:** You too.

(10) **JUNIOR FANCIERS.**

Committee Chair: *Sheri Shaffer – Albert Sweitzer*

Liaison to Board: *Anne Mathis*

List of Committee Members: *Rhonda Smith, Albert Sweitzer, Brian Tripp, Beth Grant-Field*

Brief Summation of Immediate Past Committee Activities:

Junior Fanciers has many of our Juniors taking part in CFA Cat Shows these past six months, mainly in Regions 1 and 7. Our Juniors are enjoying shows and enjoying showing their cats.

Future Projections for Committee:

We are working on a Guideline for Regions to develop a partnership with 4-H Programs. Junior Fanciers' trial program, where we joined with Pennsylvania's 4-H State Program, has successfully engaged over twenty Juniors who have continued to take part in CFA shows following our joint CFA-4-H show held in July 2023.

Our guideline will include how to reach out to different state 4-H programs, teaching Juniors cat show etiquette, how to bathe and groom a cat, discussing supplies needed at a cat show (show tent, cat bed, etc.), and how to best present one's cat to a Judge.

Board Action Items:

N/A

Time Frame:

Next Six Months – we hope to have our guidelines ready, and we hope to have another joint CFA-4-H Cat show in the Pennsylvania area.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Sheri Shaffer, M.A., CFA Junior Fanciers' Co-Chair*

Mastin: Junior Fanciers. **Tartaglia:** Sheri is here. **Shaffer:** I'm here. **Mastin:** Hi Sheri. **Shaffer:** **Mastin:** See, it just happens. Allene is right on the ball. Thank you for joining us. Does anybody have any questions or comments for Sheri? Sheri, have you got any quick messages for the board? **Shaffer:** We plan to have guidelines for all of you at the annual and we will present that if you will allow us in closed session on Sunday in Iowa, if all of you are OK with that. **Mastin:** Since you are putting me on the spot, I don't have any objections to it because I don't even know what's on the agenda yet, but just get it in to Rachel and she will have it on Sunday's agenda. **Shaffer:** It will be guidelines for how we reached out to Penn State's 4H and how we developed our beginning and how we reached out the programs and how other states can do that. **Mastin:** OK, wonderful. **Shaffer:** Thank you. **Mastin:** Thank you Sheri. Have a great night. **Shaffer:** You, too.

(11) **EXPERIMENTAL FORMATS.**

Committee Chair: Rachel Anger

Mastin: Experimental Formats. **Anger:** I would like to make a standing motion on all of the action items under the Experimental Formats. **Mastin:** Does anyone want to make a standing second? **Currle:** Kenny will do a standing second. **Mastin:** OK Kenny, thank you.

Board Action Items:

(a) ***Summit Request – GEMS/CFW July 27-28, 2024***

For the past seven years, with the support of the CFA Board, GEMS has successfully produced Breed Summits that take breed focus to another level. The Board has graciously supported our requests to have combined breed judging for the Egyptian Maus.

The Breed Specialty judging – Per Summit judging guidelines (included below), In eight Allbreed rings All Egyptian Mau classes, kittens, championship and premiership will be judged together, top three in each class awarded and then awards given overall based on the total entry for each breed: up to 15 entries = top 3; 15 to 20 entries = top 4; 25 or more entries = top 5. No points will be associated with these awards. Best of the Best for each breed will be awarded at end of show based on breed results from these rings. With finals used as a tie breaker.

Details on the show are as follows:

Chantilly Virginia, July 27-28, 2024. Format is a 10 ring back to back show with 8 AB rings.

Proposed show hours: Egyptian Mau judging start both days at 7:30AM. Show hours for all other breeds would start at 9AM.

All judges were notified of this request when contracted and if approved the format will be noted on the flyer.

Motion: *Grant an exception to Show Rule 7.01 and 11.35 and allow the Global Egyptian Mau Society/Cat Fanciers Of Washington to hold breed specialty rings for Egyptian Maus in the allbreed rings at their co-sponsored 10 ring back to back show on July 27-28, 2024 In Chantilly, Virginia (Region 7) in the following manner: all classes (Kittens, Championship and Premiership) will be judged consecutively and awarded in the usual manner, which will include top three breed awards; then, a breed specialty final for each breed will be held across all classes (i.e., including Kittens, Championship and Premiership competing together in a breed specialty final). Awards will be given based on the total Breed entry for each breed as follows: up to 15 entries = top 3; 15 to 20 entries = top 4; 25 or more entries = top 5. No points will be associated with these awards.*

Anger: I have several action items. The first one is the summit request submitted by GEMS, who is literally the author of the summit guidelines. Their request is according to the guidelines. There are no exceptions. You see the lengthy request there which encompasses their

show format. **Mastin:** On the first motion, any discussion? Any objections? Seeing no objection, the motion passes unanimously.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Summit judging guidelines:

Summit judging for Breed Club shows and shows that are honoring breeds.

Any breed club hosting a show can schedule breed summit judging at their show. They should be encouraged to do so.

Any club “honoring” a breed can ask for breed summit judging at their show. This should be limited to only two breeds or division per show.

It should be limited to AB rings only. This is mostly for the sake of the schedule.

Clubs wishing to have this type of judging “must” communicate with their judges their intention, when contracting them. Judges may “opt” out. The “opt” out must be done at the time they sign their contract. Clubs can cancel if they do not get the entries to ensure success.

All information on the Summit, including judges who will be participating, must be clearly marked on the flyer. Basics of Summit breed judging.

All kittens, cats and premiers of a breed will be judged at the same time. Mechanics of it depend on how many cats of a breed are present.

Judge shall hang, BOB and 2BOB (and in this case 3rd BOB) on each class. The judge then calls back their top XX to give out overall best.

- *1-5 present in breed BOB and 2nd overall best.*
- *6-10- Best through 3.*
- *11-15- Best through 4th.*
- *15+ Best through 5th.*

Show Rules:

7.01 ... In cases where the show contains a separate breed summit workshop type activity, the breed summit workshop shall not be conducted by a judge authorized to judge a competitive class at the show (kitten, championship, premiership, or household pet) before that judge has completed judging all of their competitive classes. If the individual scheduled to perform the breed summit workshop is not judging one of the regular classes, the summit workshop can be conducted at any time during the show. ...

11.35... No award shall be offered for which the officiating judge must make a decision in addition to those required for official CFA awards.

(b) Experimental Format Request – Traditional Style Ring

Just Cat-In Around Cat Fanciers is holding a show April 13/14, 2024 in Taylor, Michigan (Region 4). At the February 2024 board meeting, the board was introduced to the possibility of basing future shows a bit more on the “traditional” show approach used by European associations. Just Cat-In Around believes this might enable the club to provide exhibitors with a modest level of specific feedback on their cats, which they are telling us (via Facebook) that they would love to have and would value greatly. It would be fun and a new format of interest to the fancy. The proposal is to allow one traditional style ring on Sunday, to be judged by Rachel Anger, who is a regular Saturday judge at the show. Exhibitors would sign up in advance for a 10-15 minute one-on-one session.

Motion: *For its April 13/14, 2024 show in Taylor, Michigan (Region 4), allow Just Cat-In Around Cat Fanciers to hold a one-on-one traditional style ring on Sunday, April 14, 2024, conducted by Allbreed Judge Rachel Anger.*

Anger: At the Just Cat-In Around show, we would like to hold a traditional style ring. The possibility of doing a traditional style ring was discussed at our last board meeting and we would like to give it a try at our show not this coming weekend but the following weekend in Taylor, Michigan, to have a little traditional style ring judged by Allbreed Judge Rachel Anger.

Mastin: Discussion? Objections? Motion passes unanimously.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

Mastin: Congratulations. **Anger:** Thank you, and that is the end of the Experimental Format requests. **Mastin:** Anybody have any questions for Rachel? OK, thank you Rachel.

Anger: Thank you.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Rachel Anger, Chair*

(12) BOARD-SPONSORED DELEGATE PROPOSALS.

Motion: Sponsor the following Bylaw amendments:

Proposed Amendments to the CFA Bylaws

Deleted text is shown with a ~~strike through~~ and new text is underscored. Unless otherwise stated, any Constitutional Amendments are effective immediately.

- 1 - CFA Executive Board

RESOLVED: Amend the CFA Bylaws, ARTICLE VIII – REGIONS, Section 1 -- Geographical Boundaries, to redefine regional boundaries to avoid splitting states between regions, as follows:

ARTICLE VIII — REGIONS

Section 1 – Geographical Boundaries

The United States, Canada, Bermuda, Mexico, Japan and Europe are divided into nine (9) geographical regions as follows:

REGION 1 - NORTH ATLANTIC

Bermuda, Canada (East of the 77th meridian), Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York (~~East of the 77th meridian~~), Pennsylvania (~~East of the 77th meridian~~), Rhode Island, and Vermont.

REGION 2 - NORTHWEST

Alaska, ~~California (North of the 36th parallel)~~, Canada (West of the Western border of Manitoba), Idaho, Montana, ~~Nevada (North of the 37th parallel)~~, Oregon, Utah and Washington.

REGION 3 - GULF SHORE

Arkansas, Colorado, ~~Kansas (South of the 38th parallel)~~, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Tennessee (~~West of the Tennessee River~~), Texas, Wyoming, and the Mexican states of Aguascalientes, Campeche, Chiapas, Chihuahua, Coahuila, Colima, Durango, Federal District, Guanajuato, Guerrero, Hidalgo, Jalisco, México, Michoacán, Morelos, Nayarit, Nuevo Leon, Oaxaca, Puebla, Querétaro, Quintana Roo, San Luis Potosí, Tabasco, Tamaulipas, Tlaxcala, Veracruz, Yucatán, and Zacatecas.

REGION 4 - GREAT LAKES

Canada (East of the 90th meridian and West of the 77th meridian), Kentucky (~~North of the 38th parallel~~), Michigan, ~~New York (West of the 77th meridian)~~, Ohio, ~~Pennsylvania (West of the 77th meridian)~~, and West Virginia.

REGION 5 - SOUTHWEST

Arizona, ~~California (South of the 36th parallel)~~, Hawaii, ~~Nevada (South of the 37th parallel)~~, and the Mexican states of Baja California Norte, Baja California Sur, Sinaloa, and Sonora.

REGION 6 - MIDWEST

Canada (East of the Western border of Manitoba and West of the 90th meridian), Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas (~~North of the 38th parallel~~), Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

REGION 7 - SOUTHERN

Alabama, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, ~~Kentucky (South of the 38th parallel)~~, Maryland, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, ~~Tennessee (East of the Tennessee River)~~, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and Virginia.

REGION 8 - JAPAN

Japan.

REGION 9 - EUROPE

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Kosovo, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Macedonia, Malta, Monaco, Moldova, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom.

RATIONALE: While GPS coordinates might define a specific location, it is far easier to articulate a location/region by its state boundaries when making decisions that potentially affect in what region a person resides. Using state boundaries removes any possibility of misinterpretation of actual residential information and assignment of region to an exhibitor.

– 2 – *CFA Executive Board*

RESOLVED: Effective June 28, 2026, amend the CFA Bylaws, ARTICLE VIII – REGIONS, Section 1 -- Geographical Boundaries, to redefine regional boundaries and names, amend ARTICLE VI – OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS, Section 1 – Titles and ARTICLE VII – EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETINGS AND VOTING, Section 1 – Membership, to reduce the number Regional Directors from nine to six, and amend ARTICLE IV – ANNUAL AND SPECIAL MEETINGS, Section 1 – Annual Meetings, to adjust the regional names and order of meetings, as follows:

ARTICLE VIII — REGIONS

Section 1 – Geographical Boundaries

The United States, Canada, Bermuda, Mexico, Japan and Europe are divided into ~~nine (9)~~ six (6) geographical regions as follows:

REGION 1 - ~~NORTH-ATLANTIC~~

Bermuda, Canada (East of the 77th meridian), Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York (East of the 77th meridian), Pennsylvania (East of the 77th meridian), North Carolina, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Carolina, US Virgin Islands, and Vermont, and Virginia.

REGION 2 – NORTHWESTGREAT LAKES

Alaska, California (North of the 36th parallel), Canada (West of the Western border of Manitoba), Idaho, Montana, Nevada (North of the 37th parallel), Oregon, Utah and Washington. Alabama, Canada (East of the 90th meridian and West of the 77th meridian), Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Mississippi, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

REGION 3 - GULF SHOREMIDWEST

Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas (South of the 38th parallel), Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Tennessee (West of the Tennessee River), Texas, Wyoming, and the Mexican states of Aguascalientes, Campeche, Chiapas, Chihuahua, Coahuila, Colima, Durango, Federal District, Guanajuato, Guerrero, Hidalgo, Jalisco, México, Michoacán, Morelos, Nayarit, Nuevo Leon, Oaxaca, Puebla, Querétaro, Quintana Roo, San Luis Potosí, Tabasco, Tamaulipas, Tlaxcala, Veracruz, Yucatán, and Zacatecas. Arkansas, Canada (East of the Western border of Manitoba and West of the 90th meridian) Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and the Mexican states of Aguascalientes, Campeche, Chiapas, Chihuahua, Coahuila, Colima, Durango, Federal District, Guanajuato, Guerrero, Hidalgo, Jalisco, México, Michoacán, Morelos, Nayarit, Nuevo Leon, Oaxaca, Puebla, Querétaro, Quintana Roo, San Luis Potosí, Tabasco, Tamaulipas, Tlaxcala, Veracruz, Yucatán , and Zacatecas.

REGION 4 - GREAT LAKESWEST

Canada (East of the 90th meridian and West of the 77th meridian), Kentucky (North of the 38th parallel), Michigan, New York (West of the 77th meridian), Ohio, Pennsylvania (West of the 77th meridian), and West Virginia. Alaska, Arizona, California, Canada (West of the Western border of Manitoba), Hawaii, Idaho, Mexican states of Baja California Norte, Baja California Sur, Sinaloa, and Sonora, Montana, Nevada , Oregon, Utah, Washington and Wyoming.

REGION 5 – SOUTHWEST

Arizona, California (South of the 36th parallel), Hawaii, Nevada (South of the 37th parallel), and the Mexican states of Baja California Norte, Baja California Sur, Sinaloa, and Sonora.

REGION 6 – MIDWEST

Canada (East of the Western border of Manitoba and West of the 90th meridian), Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas (North of the 38th parallel), Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

REGION 7 – SOUTHERN

Alabama, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky (South of the 38th parallel), Maryland, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee (East of the Tennessee River), the U.S. Virgin Islands, and Virginia.

REGION 8 – JAPAN

Japan.

REGION 96 - EUROPE

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Kosovo, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Macedonia, Malta, Monaco, Moldova, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom.

ARTICLE VI — OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS

Section 1 – Titles

The officers of this Association shall be President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer.

The Directors of this Association shall consist of ~~nine (9)~~ six (6) Regional Directors, representing the geographical regions herein specified, provided that not more than one person resident in any one of the Regions specified shall be elected a Regional Director, and five (5) Directors at Large.

No person may hold more than one office.

ARTICLE VII — EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETINGS AND VOTING

Section 1 – Membership

The government of the affairs of this Association shall be in the hands of the Executive Board. The President, the Vice President, the Secretary, the Treasurer, the ~~nine (9)~~ six (6) Regional Directors, and the five (5) Directors at Large of this Association shall be members of the Executive Board.

ARTICLE IV — ANNUAL AND SPECIAL MEETINGS

Section 1 – Annual Meetings

The Annual Meeting of the Association shall be held commencing on the third, fourth or fifth (if applicable) Friday in June, or the first Friday in July, of each year in each of the regions listed below successively (excluding the Japan and Europe regions), beginning in ~~1982~~ 2026 and in the following order:

West, Atlantic, Great Lakes, Midwest. ~~Midwest, Southern, North Atlantic, Northwest, Gulf Shore, Great Lakes, Southwest.~~

There shall be no change in the order of rotation, and each time an Annual Meeting shall have been held in each of the ~~seven~~ four Regions, the order of rotation shall thereafter be repeated. A city within the eligible Region shall be chosen for the Annual Meeting to be held five years hence and announced to the delegates to the Annual Meeting of the Association. Electronic or written notice of the time and place of the Annual Meeting shall be made to member clubs by the Central Office not less than forty (40) nor more than fifty (50) days prior to the opening day of the meeting.

The Executive Board shall have authority by two-thirds (2/3rds) vote of the entire Executive Board to change the Annual Meeting date, location and/or manner of meeting if circumstances outside the control of the Association arise. Notice of such change shall be provided to member clubs by the Central Office as set forth above.

RATIONALE: Due to the ever-changing world, CFA has become bloated on the board level and needs to become more in line with the size of our organization. Also, with the decline of our registrations and our bottom line we need to get our expense in line with our income.

Anger: Then we are skipping the old #12, of course. **Mastin:** Skipping #12. It was withdrawn, and we are now on to Board-Sponsored Delegate Proposals. Pam Moser. **Moser:** Thank you. First of all, I want to thank Ed for putting in the time to write these amendments up. I know it takes a lot of time and I appreciate it, Ed. We all struggle to find the best solutions for CFA as a whole. I'm aware of all the chatter going on about my idea to realign the regions' orders, but it takes ideas. Ideas are what move organizations forward, and organizations such as CFA have to move from time to time, to keep pace with the rest of the world to keep in tune with our customers who are not necessarily in the same place they were 50 years ago. I am no expert on geography, but I have been on the board long enough to recognize we need to do something. People don't like change and I am growing weary of people becoming a punching bag when they come up with a new idea. Our board consists of 18 members. Fortune 500 companies have 11 directors, and not-for-profit organizations have 8 to 14. I encourage you to think about this and come up with some productive ideas to bring forward at the annual to reduce the size of the board. I respectfully withdraw my requests for the board to support these amendments. **Mastin:** You are withdrawing? **Moser:** Yes, I am. **Mastin:** Both of them? **Moser:** Yes. **Mastin:** OK, thank you.

Mastin: Anybody have any additional comments? **Anger:** Thank you, Pam, for saying that. It is a risk when you put forward a progressive idea with the best of intentions in a format that you think will get the ball rolling. Change is not going to be popular, but I understand your concept, Pam, being something that could prospectively have been a good business decision. So, for those that are listening in on the meeting, when we bring forward an idea that's progressive, it's not that we particularly are seeking an opportunity to make a big change, it's because our job here at the board table is to address the business of the association. So, sometimes when someone has a passion in one area, a board member's proposal may come forward and be offensive in some way. Proposals are not meant to offend or go after anyone, they are meant to address the business of the association. We're not trying to slip anything through here in a secret meeting; what we're trying to do is get discussion going. I appreciate your efforts very much Pam, thank you. **Mastin:** Thank you Rachel. **Newkirk:** I will echo what Rachel said. Pam, I appreciate you. You and I had a little phone conversation and I was willing to support you on both of these. I'm sometimes at a loss for words. Rachel is right, nobody wants change, but I'm telling you something – and this is for the people listening in – this organization has got to change. If we don't change, we are going to do a big belly flop. We have to match incomes and revenues with expenses, and that's way out of whack right now. So, you may sit back and say, "oh, I don't want to lose my position on the board." Well, I'll give you mine, OK? You can have mine. It's all yours. Just let me know when you want to take over. It's no fun sitting here, and you know what? We try to make difficult financial decisions to keep this association afloat, and what do we get? We get a lot of BS from people. You know what? I'm sort of tired of it. Instead of thanks for putting in a good, hard day's work reading all these reports and everything and trying to keep up of date, but I'm telling you something, change is going to happen or we're going to die. You may not like some of the changes that are going to come, but for this organization to be financially afloat, they've got to be made. That's the bottom line, period. Thank you. **Mastin:** Thank you Darrell. **Moser:** I want to thank Rachel and Darrell for saying that, because that is exactly what

is going on here. We do – we have to make some changes. It’s tough. We can’t have a “ME” association, it’s an “US” association. We’ve got to do what’s best for the association, what’s not best for me. Thank you. **Mastin:** OK Pam, thank you again, and thank you to Rachel and Darrell for your comments. They were very important. As Darrell said, we’ve got some tough decisions to make ahead of us. We’ll be making them hopefully on May 7th. If we can’t get it finalized on May 7th, we have another date scheduled on May 14th, so we will work at this until we can get it right. We’ve just got to do what we’ve got to do.

Unfinished Business and General Orders

(13) OTHER COMMITTEES.

Mastin: Let's move on to the next one. Rachel, do we have any Other Committees?

Anger: No other committees have come forward with additional items.

(14) **NEW BUSINESS.**

(a) ***Persian and Exotic Club Format Change Request.***

The Persian and Exotic Cat Club is sponsoring a two-day 5 ring show on April 20/21, 2024 in Hong Kong. The show is in a shopping mall, with a very large LED wall on top of it. It would be a very good chance to draw the attention of the cat fancy in Hong Kong. The club's committee members are all thinking about how to make the show more attractive and they would like to increase the chance for exhibitors of getting a rosette and entering a final. They would like to change the judging format of Suki Lee's ring from AB+OCP, to SSP+OCP. Suki has agreed to the change.

Motion: *For the Persian and Exotic Cat Club's show on April 20/21, 2024 in Hong Kong (ID), grant an exception to Show Rule 4.04 and allow a format change from 1 AB/OCP (Lee); 1 AB/SSP; 3 AB to 1 SSP/OCP (Lee); 1 AB/SSP; 3 AB.*

20 - 21(L), HONG KONG, HONG KONG, Tai Po Mega Mall, Zone C, G/F Tai Po Mega Mall
Tai Po, Hong Kong, PERSIAN & EXOTIC CAT CLUB, 1 AB/OCP (Lee); 1 AB/SSP; 3 AB
Judges: E. PODPRUGINA(AB), E. HAMAYASU(AB), E. MAEDA(SSP), A. UEDA(AB), S.
LEE(AB)

Entry Limit: 75

Entry Clerk: ALEX CHAN, 5/F, 70 SOUTH WALL ROAD, KOWLOON, (852)9133736

Email: ALEXCHAN310@HOTMAIL.COM

Mastin: Alright, New Business. Who is doing New Business? I don't have a name on it, but I've got a couple things in here. Persian and Exotic Club – there's a bunch of things here.

Anger: Rachel can do those. **Mastin:** Who is doing them? **Anger:** Rachel. **Mastin:** OK. So, do

you want to take the first one? **Anger:** Sure. This is obviously the Persian and Exotic Club, holding a show in Hong Kong. They just want to change their format to provide their exhibitors with more opportunities to show, to make it more attractive for people coming in at this big event that they are having at the shopping mall. So, it's just a simple change adding to Suki Lee's ring a super specialty. They are just requesting to change their show license, and I so move what the motion says there. **Currle:** Second. **Mastin:** Hang on before we do the motion and second. Let's

hear from Kathy and Matthew. There may be an update on this. **Kathy?** **Calhoun:** I believe there is an update. There was some concerns from Central Office about the combo of the super specialty plus OCP, primarily not in concept but in timing of the year and getting all this done by the end of the season. Matthew had some conversations with the club, and the club is

withdrawing the request for the super specialty plus OCP. I don't know if Matthew has a further update. **Mastin:** Matthew? **Wong:** Yes, what Kathy said is correct. Kathy, myself and Allene had some email conversations. I spoke to the club and the show manager. The intention was to have great fun and a lot of newcomers, but we understand the manual work in both, in scoring these kinds of special rings, so we will do it, not in April when everybody is already very stressed. We will try and do it the beginning of next show season, thank you. So, we are withdrawing. **Mastin:** Kathy and Matthew, thank you for that update. Anything further on that?

Anger: So, I am withdrawing my motion.

Withdrawn.

(b) Midwest TGIF Fanciers OCP Show Format Change Request.

The Midwest TGIF Fanciers would like to formally request changing the format of their August 3-4, 2024 show to include the OCP final in two rings, one each day, as defined by the newly approve rule change 2.39 for the 2024-25 show rules. This would be part of two existing Allbreed rings and not separate rings. Brian Pearson (Saturday) and Kathy Black (Sunday), who have already been contracted to judge the show, have agreed to add the OCP final to their ring. The club understands that there must be 30 open/champions and 15 open / premiers for the final to be held. The show is licensed as a 7 AB/1 SP show. Scoring would be for grand points only for the op/ch and op/pr portion of the final with no points awarded in breed. If the minimums entries are not achieved, that portion of the final will not be held.

Motion: Grant an exception to Show Rule 4.04 and allow the Midwest TGIF Fanciers to change its show license to include two OCP rings using already contracted judges at their August 3/4, 2024 show in Gray Summit, Missouri (Region 6). Scoring would be for grand points only for the op/ch and op/pr portion of the final with no points awarded in breed. If the minimums entries are not achieved, that portion of the final will not be held.

Anger: We will go on to (b), which is Midwest TGIF. Of course, our OCP format has been approved, but this request addresses a change to their show license so that the Midwest TGIF Fanciers can add an OCP ring to their show. **Mastin:** Who is the second, Kenny? **Currle:** Kenny. **Mastin:** OK, that's what I thought. You've still got that quick draw tonight going. **Currle:** Thank you very much. **Mastin:** Discussion? Objections? Seeing no objection, that motion passes unanimously.

The motion is ratified by unanimous consent.

(c) Judges' Association Club Requests.

Anger: Now that Anne is on the call, I think she may be presenting (c) Judges' Association Club Requests. **Mastin:** Hi Anne. I see you joined us a long time ago actually. **Mathis:** I'm here. Yes, I'm in Atlanta at the Delta club. **Mastin:** OK, great. **Mathis:** I assume people have looked this over. They reached out to the JA Club and the judges for their input on these items, and I think they just want approval on this. **Mastin:** So, are you making a standing motion, Anne? **Mathis:** We can call it that, yes. They want thoughts, suggestions and opportunity for improvement. That would be the wording Jacqui is putting there. Item #1 has to do with wanting to have some input on what the JPC wants to change. #2 is the ability to know who has accused a judge of wrongdoing. #3 I think has to do with judging in really cold or really hot show halls, and that was just things brought up by JA members. **Mastin:** OK, we're going to take these one at a time.

To Cat Fancy Association Board of Directors

cc: Head of Judging Program Committee

The JA Club has, per our constitution, reached out to obtain input from our CFA judge colleagues regarding issues they would like to our club bring to the attention of the CFA Board

and to the Judging Program Committee. Subsequent voting showed that members of the Judges Association had the following thoughts, suggestions and opportunity for improvement.

Item 1 – *The ability to provide feedback directly to the board regarding JPC rule updates and changes. While all colleagues respect and admire the Judges Program Committee and fully support the need of the committee, we would like the opportunity to provide feedback on changes directly to the board. To accomplish this, we would like the board to consider sending a ballot of proposed changes to the CFA judging program to all approved allbreed CFA judges for our feedback. We believe that knowing the thoughts of the CFA judge population will allow the board to operate with more information.*

Mastin: We will start with item #1. Who has a second on this? **Anger:** Rachel will second. **Mastin:** Thank you Rachel. **Anger:** I would like to reserve the right to vote no. **Mastin:** OK. So Russell, do you have any comments on this? **Webb:** I feel it's going to interfere with our Committee, so I'm going to reserve the right to vote no on this. **Mathis:** As will I. **Mastin:** Is Vicki still with us? You have a right to vote no. **Tartaglia:** I can bring her back in. **Mastin:** While that's going on, Marilee, you're also on the Judging Program Committee, correct? **Griswold:** That's correct. **Mastin:** Do you want to share any thoughts you might have? **Griswold:** I think the JPC, those are appointed positions by you. If anything, I would think that this would require some pretty significant changes to that. How do you feel about it? **Mastin:** I have concerns. I wanted to hear from all of you on what your concerns were, because I do have some. **Moser:** I'm a little concerned. I don't understand how come the JA Club is coming to the board with these requests, when no other club comes to the board with requests like this. I think they are overstepping their bounds, personally. **Anger:** I disagree with that, because that is the reason they were formed as a club – to give the judges a voice. Some of their proposals here are going to be difficult to incorporate. This is one of them. We have 100 CFA judges who are judges because they are very opinionated. We would never get anything done if 100 judges were to give input, so I'm opposed to the first item. Our President has appointed a Committee to take on this work. It's extremely tedious. Every word is important, and I would like to think we are specialists in doing this, but you can see that things happen; for instance, in the rule where we eliminated some of the items from the rules inadvertently, we had to go back and fix. So, I think this is ill advised.

Nye: Thank you for letting me speak to this. I have a great concern, just like Pam, for a club to be coming to the board. My understanding of them getting a club was so that they could create amendments and resolutions to bring to the delegates, such as that of asking for a raise. Yes, there are other problems judges have – judging in a freezing cold show hall. This doesn't actually reflect the opinions of the judges. First of all, the constitution of this club totally eliminates our Associate Judges. We have 138 total judges, but they have disenfranchised 40 of them from not having a vote. These four questions here came from a poll that they did. There were approximately 65 JA members that were eligible to vote. Of that, only 34 voted. #1 received 15 votes. #2 received 16 votes. That's so minor and it's such a small percentage. I feel that it's a vocal minority that is speaking out here. Again, we would never get any work done. We try to take into account the opinions of the judges. We also have to work within the structure of our existing Show Rules, Judging Program Rules and Code of Ethics. It's not always pleasant to everybody that has to do so. So, I think with only 15 votes, this should not even have come as

a positive item for the board to even think about. That's not even half of the total votes that were cast on this. [Transcript goes through the other proposals]

Mastin: I just want to remind all the board members, we are on item #1 right now. **Nye:** Oops, sorry. **Mastin:** I've got the motion maker and the second with the right to vote no. **Raymond:** I'm a little concerned with the precedent of allowing a club different access and different rights than the other clubs in the organization. **Mastin:** That is a concern. **Calhoun:** For item #1, the motion is for *the board to consider sending a ballot of proposed changes to the CFA judging program to all approved allbreed CFA judges for our feedback.* That's the motion, in essence? For item #1, that's the motion? **Mastin:** Anne, is that the essence? **Mathis:** I believe it is. I know Jacqui told me months ago that these items were brought to her by members of the JA as items they wanted brought up. That's where this came from. **Calhoun:** My question is, when the Judging Program – maybe I'm remembering incorrectly, but when the Judging Program has potential changes, it's pre-noticed to everybody, right? **Mathis:** I think it is. **Calhoun:** So, everybody has a chance for feedback. You don't have a vote, but you have a chance, an opportunity for feedback. That exists today. **Mathis:** That's all that #1 says is, the ability to provide feedback, so we already have that, really. **Calhoun:** We already have that. **Mathis:** Apparently, some judges feel we don't and I think that's where this came from, but we do.

Currle: Just a couple of things. They're not asking us to vote on any of this stuff, they're asking for suggestions. They want us to talk about these items. I don't see any requests for a motion or approval anywhere in this thing here. I do have a problem with the fact that we're going to restrict clubs to come with suggestions like that to the board. We're an association of clubs. I understand what they want. They want input. They would like to have input to the board, and that's what we should be doing right now, but as far as putting this to a vote, I don't see the need. Let's just give them some feedback. I think that's all they are asking for. **Mathis:** Yeah, I would agree. I think we can provide feedback in saying that they have a chance to provide feedback, although sometimes the things that get discussed and brought to the board, I think what they want is an opportunity to provide feedback before it's brought to the board, and to me that becomes difficult, because by the time the JPC puts it all together, it's ready for the board. But, as it was said, they have a chance for feedback when they see it on the board reports. Certainly, we got feedback about several things for this meeting. **Mastin:** OK, so if these are not motions and they're just looking for feedback, who on the board is going to give them feedback on each one of these items? **Mathis:** I can certainly give Jacqui feedback and tell her what the board's feelings were on these items. **Newkirk:** The JA Club is not like any other club in this organization. It's a club made up of judges, and I will tell you this. I have heard complaints over the years that the Judging Program Committee does not represent or protect the judges of this organization, and from what I've seen I have to agree with that comment. The Judging Program may think that that's not their responsibility, but Rich, you appoint the chairs and they fill in people, and I think they do a good job. I'm not complaining about it. **Mastin:** Vicki, did you have anything you wanted to say? **Nye:** Yes. I'm concerned with the thought that this represents the majority of our judges, and it doesn't. This is a small percentage. As I said, #1 had 15 votes that wanted to send it to the board.

Item 2 – The ability to face the originator of concerns and accusations. Judges are often asked to respond to anonymous concerns and accusations with no ability to face the individual who has raised the concerns. This means that judges must respond to an issue without all of the

information they may need. In some instances, this may result in the accused judge being asked to solve a problem without understanding the root cause of said problem. Feedback from some of our colleagues notes that many feel frustrated defending themselves against whispers and innuendos. This causes severe moral issues, especially in our younger and associate judges. We would like to be aware of the source of accusations. CFA judges are professionals who judge cats, not people, and awareness of the source is not going to change that. If someone feels strongly about bringing an issue up to our board or to the JPC, then they should be willing to include their name. Our board and the JPC should trust in our judges' professionalism at handling these situations.

Nye: With regard to #2, the ability for the originator to face your accuser. We have had this policy for years, that the Judging Program will protect the name of the accuser. It's not that it's anonymous to the Judging Program Committee or the board if they choose to ask who submitted a complaint, but we do need to protect those because many people are afraid of writing a complaint if their name is going to be used. **Newkirk:** This item #2 has always just jerked my hind end around. I can't stand anonymous complaints, and especially complaints about the judge. If you want to bitch and complain about a judge, you can walk up to me in any ring and tell me what you think, because I'll listen to you. I may not agree with you, but this writing and complaining to the ombudsman, then you have to respond to it without sometimes knowing where the thing is coming from. How is that fair? Everybody has a right to face their accuser and if they are afraid to do it, too bad. Then don't complain. We take it on the chin a lot as a judge. People don't know it, but that ring is like a funnel for sound. All that bitching and complaining that people make out in the audience because you didn't use their cat or you didn't pick their cat and they say it, we hear it. If you want to complain about me, tell me who you are. I'll sit down and have a conversation with you, but I hate this anonymous stuff, and I agree there should be no anonymous complaints. You have a right to know who accused you of doing something wrong. **Mastin:** OK Darrell, anything else? **Newkirk:** I think I've said enough. **Mathis:** I think we had a discussion about this recently and I know yeah, we want to know who complained against us but those people are worried to do that, so they won't do it. I don't know where the answer is in that one, myself. Certainly, if I'm accused of something, I would like to know but I also understand that a new exhibitor that wants to make a complaint doesn't want to ruin their cat fancy by complaining about a judge, so I don't want to be the one to make that decision. **Nye:** I just wanted to say, on item #2, of the 39 complaints that we had last year, there was only one that came in where the complainant wanted their name not used. That's obviously the vast majority of them, they used their names. If I need to on these social media ones, I will be happy to put my name on it. If somebody sends a picture to me and now I see it, I can't unsee it, and so I guess I would be the complainant. I'm willing to do that. If I need to follow the rules and make sure that the judges are, then I'll put my name on it, but as far as anonymous complaints, that is a tiny, tiny number. #2 had 16. They want the board to consider sending a ballot of proposed changes to the CFA Judging Program before any action is taken.

Item 3 – Show hall climates. Judges have recently been subjected to show halls which were not climate-controlled, resulting in very uncomfortable working conditions for judges, clerks, exhibitors, and cats. We respectfully request that the board send a reminder to all ID clubs (especially in China) that if a show hall is not climate-controlled, per show rule 5.01g, that information needs to be on the flier. Also, that that flier needs to be sent to the judge IN ENGLISH prior to the show so the judge can pack accordingly.

Nye: I don't have any problem with #3. **Mastin:** Vicki, how many did #3 get? How many were supportive of #3? **Nye:** There were only 34 people that voted. It got 22. **Mastin:** So, you don't even have 50% of the judges voting on this. **Nye:** No, no. There's only 65 people that belong to the JA to begin with, and the only 34 voted altogether. **Calhoun:** Item #3 is something that the ID Committee is certainly well on the way in embracing that. The conditions in show halls, you cannot have people go in a show hall in coats and gloves. We have to work on it. As far as the flyer being sent to a judge in English so they can know how to pack, I think they ought to know how to pack if they're going somewhere because you know where you're going, but that's OK. I actually think the flyer in English is a good thing, so we will work on that.

Item 4 – The ability to utilize retired judges in the capacity of mentoring and education for new judges. As CFA and the judging program move forward, there are a number of judges who have retired from active judging but would like to continue to participate in our hobby and in the development of new judges. We request the board consider allowing retired judges in good standing to serve as mentors to new judges.

Nye: #4, I don't think that they should be dictating to the Judging Program Committee who we should be using for mentors and education. I just think this whole concept here of a club writing in and telling you what they want to happen is not appropriate. **Mastin:** Vicki, thank you for sharing that information.

Mastin: I'm hearing requests need to go to the board. These are not motions. It should be addressed by the Judging Program Committee. When I read through this whole page, I count 5 action items on here that they are requesting of the board, or indirectly to the board through the JPC. **Mathis:** Right. **Mastin:** So, I'm going to kick it back to Vicki and Russell and Anne and Marilee, because we're just going to go in circles on this. If this is a motion, we've got two people involved – the one making and the one seconding – have the right to vote no. There's all kinds of issues with this, so I'm kicking it back to you folks and you digest this, come back to the board and tell us what you want. **Mathis:** I think this might need to be a JPC decision, which they won't all like, but like you said, not everyone likes everything we do. **Mastin:** I agree, but in here there might be some valuable information that the JPC can pick up on and say, "oh, OK, we will reach out to you and we want your feedback on certain things." If the majority vote in favor of something, the JPC considers it. **Mathis:** Right. **Mastin:** You're representing all judges.

Mastin: OK. In #4, how many of the 34 wanted #4? **Nye:** 14 of the 138 judges that we have. **Mastin:** Kathy Calhoun, then Kenny, then we're going to move on. **Currie:** Vicki, the majority of the judges just want an open dialogue and they do want, as Darrell said, support from the Judging Program Committee. When you consider what they've gone through to become a judge – particularly our younger judges that are going through the Program – they really do need CFA support, so I think an open dialogue with the JPC – obviously, all of them are judges – we don't have to look at numbers, we could also look at the feedback and experience they can provide, and I think we need to keep an open mind and open communication between this particular club, which we have accepted, and the JPC, which we all respect and we certainly want you guys to continue to do the good job that you're doing, but don't throw numbers out there. There could be for the very same reasons, those numbers people didn't vote because they didn't want to be singled out, so let's just keep the communication lines open and have a happier Judging Program.

Mastin: So Anne, you are bringing these. Do you want to continue with each of these, or what do you want to do? **Mathis:** We can end them, and I will tell the club that there was – they may be on listening right now – there was a lot of discussion about it. Kenny, I appreciate what you just said. Despite the numbers, I think these issues have been brought up by judges that did not vote or are not part of the JA Club, and they are obviously concerned so we need to give them some thought and some discussion, and we did. **Mastin:** Rachel, do you agree? **Anger:** Yes. **Mastin:** OK good. That’s a good direction. Kenny and Darrell, you made some good points there. Our judges are very valuable. Sometimes they go unrecognized and congratulated for their hard work, so we’ve got to listen to them, but let’s listen to them in a direct manner. If a judge wants to send me an email – and I get them – send me an email. I’ll bring it to your attention and let you know – I’ll bring it to Vicki and Russell’s attention – as do clubs. They will send us emails directly, so let’s try to move this in the right direction. I know we’re not going to make everybody happy, but let’s just do a little bit better on what we think we can do. Let’s listen to them and grab a couple of the good ideas to keep things going in the right direction.

Respectfully Submitted for your consideration

*Jacqui Bennett
President CFA Judges Association
President JA Club
CFA Allbreed Judge*

(d) Guest Judge Proposal (not pre-noticed, requiring 2/3 to pass).

Motion: *That when a club considers hiring a guest judge to judge a CFA show, the club must first attempt to hire a licensed CFA judge residing within a 200 mile radius of the planned show, before any guest judges may be considered. The burden is on the club to provide logistical information to the Guest Judge Administrator, along with the guest judge request.*

Rationale: *We need to support CFA judges and honor the time and criteria that is required of them to advance through the CFA process. Many instances are appearing where clubs want to hire outside the CFA. Often, these individuals could have applied their efforts towards advancing through CFA but chose to put their efforts into another organization and showed no desire to be a part of CFA.*

Mastin: Rachel? **Anger:** The last one is a proposal that came in similar to what we did during COVID, I believe. This requires that clubs explore the availability of judges within 200 miles of their show hall before they contract a guest judge. So, the motion there is as you see, and I will so move. **Mastin:** Do we have a second? Who made the second? **Webb:** Russell will second. **Mastin:** Rachel, this wasn’t pre-noticed, correct? **Anger:** Correct. It’s noted there in the title of proposal. **DelaBar:** So, we use our fair share of guest judges here in Europe, as well as the ID, so we’re adding another requirement on the club if they want to hire especially one of our top tier guest judges to see within a 200 mile radius, which is approximately, let’s say 300 kilometers of the show, so we’re adding that on to them to figure out if there is a judge within 300 kilometers of Milan, Italy or whatever before we can hire a top tier judge. Is this what they’re saying? **Mastin:** Rachel? **Anger:** I think it’s something similar. The intent, of course, was to acknowledge that CFA judges go through our application and training process, and should

have preference over a guest judge when you're talking about a local show. The presenter of this motion understands that there are clubs that want to provide their exhibitors with other options and different faces, but they are requesting that CFA judges have the priority. **Calhoun:** OK, so first of all I don't think that this is enforceable, because how are you going to – who is going to monitor and police this? The second part, I agree. We have limits on the number of guest judges that can judge, given the size of the show, so I think we have already addressed that as best we can, but really, whether or not a judge in a 200 mile radius has been contacted before they go to a guest judge, that's just not enforceable, so I'm not supporting this. **Huhtaniemi:** Yeah, I'm not supporting this either. I don't want to see Pam DelaBar judging every show we have. **DelaBar:** Thank you thank you thank you. It's another constraint we're putting on clubs. I know that clubs should be able to hire what judges they want to hire. The majority of them are going to be hiring CFA judges, and rightly so, but in my case Pauli is right. I don't want to judge every show in Finland. I want the ability occasionally to be able to show and support my organization as an exhibitor also, so no, this is just adding another hindrance to our clubs in putting on their shows. **Mastin:** OK, I'm going to ask for Vicki and Russell to share their comments, and then we're going to call this motion. **Nye:** I spoke with Wendy Heidt at extent about this. She's the Guest Judge Administrator and thinking about how we would police this is a true nightmare, not just in the United States but in China and the ID. We already have restrictions on how many guest judges you can hire, and this has come to light now that we have CFF as an association that's actually in the United States and hiring one of their judges might take an assignment away from a CFA judge. Is Wendy supposed to reach out to every judge that's within 200 miles and ask them if they got an invitation, and if they didn't, did they want to judge that show? We've never had this policy for guest judges anywhere in the world. The only time this came up is when we allowed TICA to judge for us and it was supposed to be to assist the clubs to get very local judges to fill their slates during COVID and then we did have the 200 miles. I'll tell you, it was a nightmare for us to call judges and ask them, and then it was like, "oh, well you're 203 miles instead of just 200, so you're not protected." I just don't see how we can enforce this. **Mastin:** Russell, any comments? **Webb:** I agree with Vicki, because it would be a burden for us to figure all this out with these guest judges. The club should have a right to ask the judge that they want. Maybe they don't want the judge that's 200 miles away. It's a burden on the club, also. **Mastin:** OK, I'm ending discussion and we're going to call the motion. All those in favor raise your hand.

Mastin called the motion. **Motion Failed.**

Mastin: [None] All those opposed raise your hand. Darrell, Kathy Calhoun, Pam DelaBar, Carol, Mike, Kenny, Yukiko, Cathy Dunham, Pam Moser, Paula, Pauli, John, Marilee. Lower your hands. If you're an abstention raise your hand. John Colilla, are you an abstention? Rachel, I got no yes votes and no abstentions. I don't know that I called your name, Rachel. **Anger:** Not able to get my hand up. I was a no. I did not get a vote from Anne Mathis or Darrell Newkirk. It just went too fast. I apologize. **Mastin:** Darrell, were you a no? Darrell? Rachel, I think Anne left because I don't see her on the screen. **Anger:** Let's see if Darrell is still here. **Mastin:** He's on the screen. There he is. **Newkirk:** I was the first name you called. **Mastin:** OK, thanks Darrell. **Anger:** Last is Russell Webb. I'm sorry, I didn't get Russell's vote. **Webb:** I was a no. **Anger:** OK, so that's 15 no, zero yes, zero abstentions. **Mastin:** OK, motion fails. Rachel, I'll slow down calling names. My apologies. **Anger:** Thank you. It's late.

Motion Failed.

(15) **OLD BUSINESS.**

Mastin: What do we have for Old Business? **Anger:** We have no old business. **Mastin:** Were we bringing something back later today or later tonight? **Anger:** We are bringing back Darrell's motion regarding traditional date commitments to go forward with a show. Actually, somebody sent me some wonderful language that I'm waiting for permission to share with Ed and Carol. **Mastin:** Do we have Ed? **Raymond:** I drafted some language and sent it over to Darrell, since he was the – I don't know if he has had a chance to check his email to see if it's what he had in mind. **Mastin:** Darrell, have you had a chance to look at the email from Ed? **Newkirk:** I haven't seen it yet. **Mastin:** OK. Why don't we go ahead and bring that back in closed session, then we can report on it in open session, because I don't believe we have anything else, right Rachel? **Anger:** That is correct. We're at the end of our open session Orders of the Day. **Mastin:** OK, very good.

* * * * *

Mastin: I want to thank everyone for attending the meeting. We will start our next meeting at 10:45 Eastern Daylight Time. That's roughly 14 minutes. The meeting is adjourned. Thank you all.

The open session meeting was adjourned at 10:31 p.m. EST.

The executive session meeting was adjourned at 2:16 a.m. EST.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Rachel Anger, Secretary*

(16) **DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS AND SUSPENSIONS.**

Disciplinary Hearings And Suspensions: Cases that have been reviewed by the Protest Committee and for which a recommendation was presented to the Board. The following case was heard, a tentative decision was rendered, timely notice was given to the parties, and no appeal and/or appeal fee was filed. Therefore, final disposition is as follows:

24-002 CFA v Yu Bing Bing & Russell Tian

Violation of CFA Bylaws Article XV, Section 4 (b, c, e, and g)

Guilty. The board has imposed the following disciplinary action: (1) one year suspension of all CFA services and a \$500.00 fine; the fine to be paid within 30 days. If the fine is not paid prior to the end of the suspension period, the suspension will continue until the fine is paid in full; (2) CFA shall void the registration of litters F4198867, F4198866, and F4198418 and the registration of all cats, kittens, and litters registered from those three litters, or any descendants of those cats, shall be re-registered as not for breeding, and flagged as not for showing. [vote sealed]

24-010 CFA v. Patrick Au

Violation of CFA Show Rules 21.02c

Guilty. The board has imposed the following disciplinary action: (1) that Respondent be and is hereby reprimanded; (2) CFA shall void the wins, points, or titles earned by the three entries in question. [vote sealed]

Appeals: Cases that have been reviewed by the Protest Committee and for which a recommendation was presented to and heard by the Board, a tentative decision was rendered, timely notice was given to the party, an appeal and/or appeal fee was timely filed, and the appeal was heard by the Board of Directors. Therefore, final disposition is as follows:

None

Board-Cited Hearing: The Board may consider any protest filed by any member of a member club or in any other manner brought to the attention of the Executive Board. The Board may delegate authority to one or more persons to review, investigate, and determine if probable cause exists for the filing of a formal protest. This case was heard on direct cite by the CFA Executive Board. Timely notice was given to the parties, and the matter was heard. Final disposition is as follows:

None